(7)
8

THE DOCTRINES AND PRACTICES OF THE Church of Rome TRULY REPRESENTED;

In Answer to a Book Intituled,

A Papist Misrepresented, and Represented, &c.

by Edward Stillingfleet

LONDON:
Printed for *W. Rogers*, at the Sun over against St. *Dunstan's* Church in *Fleetstreet*. 1686.

THE DOCTRINES AND TRADITIONS OF THE Church of Rome

The Doctrine and Practices of the Church of *Rome*, truly represented, &c.

An Answer to the Introduction.

THE *Introduction* consists of two parts.

I. A general Complaint of the *Papists* being *Misrepresented* among us.

II. An account of the Method he hath taken to clear them from these *Misrepresentations*.

I. As to the *First*; Whether it be just, or not, must be examin'd in the several Particulars. But here we must consider, whether it serves the End it is designed for in this place, which is, to gain the Reader's good Opinion of their Innocency: Not meerly because they complain so much of being injured, but because the best Men in all Times have been *Misrepresented*; as he proves at large in this *Introduction*, from several Examples of the Old and New *Testament*, *but especially of Christ and his Apostles, and the Primitive Christians.* But it is observable, that when Bp. *Jewel* began his excellent *Apology* for the *Church* of *England*, with a Complaint much of the same Nature, and produced the very same Examples, his Adversary would by no means allow it to have any Force, being, as he called

it, *Exordium Commune*, which might be uſed on both ſides, and therefore could be proper to neither. And altho it be reaſonable only for thoſe to complain of being *Miſrepreſented*, who having Truth on their ſide, do notwithſtanding ſuffer under the Imputation of Error; yet it is poſſible for thoſe who are very much *miſtaken*, to complain of being *miſrepreſented*; and while they go about to remove the Miſrepreſentations of others, to make new Ones of their own. And as the beſt Men, and the beſt Things, have been Miſrepreſented; ſo other Men have been as apt to complain of it, and the worſt things are as much Miſrepreſented, when they are made to appear not ſo bad as they are. For *Evil* is as truly Miſrepreſented under the appearance of *Good*, as *Good* under the appearance of *Evil*; and it is hard to determine whether hath done the greater Miſchief.

So that if *the Father of Lies be the Author of Miſrepreſenting*, (as the *Introduction* begins) we muſt have a care of him both ways. For when *he tried this Black Art in Paradiſe*, (as our Author ſpeaks) it was both by miſrepreſenting the Command, and the Danger of tranſgreſſing it. He did not only make the Command appear otherwiſe than it was, but he did very much leſſen the Puniſhment of Diſobedience, and by that means deluded our firſt Parents into that Sin and Miſery, under which their Poſterity ſtill ſuffers. Which ought to be a caution to them, how dangerous it is to break the Law of God under the faireſt Colour and Pretences; and that they ſhould not be eaſily impoſed upon by falſe Gloſſes, and plauſible Repreſentations, though made by ſuch as therein pretend to be *Angels of Light*.

But although *the Father of Lies be the Author of Miſrepreſenting*: yet we have no reaſon to think but that if he were to plead his own Cauſe to Mankind, he would very much complain of being *Miſrepreſented* by them; and

and even in this reſpect, when they make him the *Father* of thoſe *Lies* which are their own Inventions. And can that be a certain Argument of Truth, which may as well be uſed by *the Father of Lies?*

And the great Inſtruments he hath made uſe of in deceiving and corrupting Mankind, have been as forward as any to complain of being Miſrepreſented. The true Reaſon is, Becauſe no great Evil can prevail in the World, unleſs it be repreſented otherwiſe than it is; and all Men are not competent Judges of the Colours of Good and Evil; therefore when the Deſigns of thoſe who go about to deceive, begin to be laid open, they then betake themſelves to the faireſt Repreſentations they can make of themſelves, and hope that many will not ſee through their Pretences.

If I had a mind to follow our Author's Method, I could make as long a Deduction of Inſtances of this kind. But I ſhall content my ſelf with ſome few Examples of thoſe who are allowed on both ſides to have been guilty of great Errors and Corruptions.

The *Arrians* pleaded they were *Miſreprented*, when they were taken for Enemies to Chriſt's Divinity; for all that they contended for, was only ſuch a Moment of Time, as would make good the Relation between Father and Son.

The *Pelagians*, with great Succeſs for ſome time (and even at *Rome*) complained, that they were very much *Miſrepreſented*, as Enemies to God's Grace; whereas they owned and aſſerted the manifold Grace of God; and were only Enemies to Mens Idelneſs and Neglect of their Duties.

The *Neſtorians* gave out, that they never intended to make two Perſons in Chriſt, as their Adverſaries charged them; but all their deſign was to avoid Blaſphemy, in calling the Bleſſed Virgin *the Mother of God*;

God; and whatever went beyond this, was their Adversaries *Misrepresentations*, and not their own Opinions.

The *Eutychians* thought themselves very hardly dealt with, for saying there was *but one Nature in Christ*, they did not mean thereby (as they said) to destroy the Properties of the Humane Nature, but only to assert that its Subsistence was swallowed up by the Divine; and of all Persons, those have no Reason to blame them, who suppose the Properties of one Substance may be united to another.

Even the *Gentile Idolaters*, when they were charged by the Christians, *that they Worshipped Stocks and Stones*, complained, they were *Misrepresented*, for they were not such Ideots to take things for Gods, which had neither Life, nor Sense, nor Motion in them. And when they were charged *with worshipping other Gods as they did the Supream*; they desired their Sense might not be taken from common Prejudices, or vulgar Practices, but from the Doctrine of their Philosophers; and they owned a Soveraign Worship due to him that was Chief; and a subordinate and Relative to some Cœlestial Beings, whom they made Application to as Mediators between him and them. Must all these Complaints now be taken for granted? what then becomes of the Reputation of General Councils, or the Primitive Christians? But as, if it were enough to be Accused, none would be Innocent; so none would be Guilty, if it were enough to complain of being Misrepresented.

Therefore in all Complaints of this Nature it is necessary to come to Particulars; and to examine with Care and Diligence the Matters complained of, and then to give Judgment in the *Case*. I am glad to find our Author professing so much *Sincerity and Truth* with-

out

out Passion; and I do assure him I shall follow what he Professes: For the Cause of our Church is such, as needs neither Tricks nor Passion to defend it; and therefore I shall endeavour to state the Matters in Difference with all the clearness and calmness that may be, and I shall keep close to his Method and Representations, without Digressions, or provoking Reflections.

II. But I must declare my self very much unsatisfied with the Method he hath taken to clear his Party from these *Misrepresentations*. For,

1. He takes upon him to draw a double Character of a Papist; and in the one he pretends to follow a certain Rule, but not in the other, which is not fair and ingenuous.

As to the one, he saith, *He follows the Council of* Trent, *and their allowed Spiritual Books and Catechisms*: and we find no fault with this. But why must the other Part then be drawn by Fancy, or common Prejudices, or ignorant Mistakes? Have we no Rule, whereby the Judgment of our Church is to be taken? Are not our Articles as easy to be had and understood, as the Decrees and Canons of the Council of *Trent*? I will not ask, How the Council of *Trent* comes to be the Rule and Measure of Doctrine to any here, where it was never received? But I hope I may, why our Representations are not to be taken from the Sense of our Church, as their's from the Council of *Trent*? If he saith, *his Design was to remove common Prejudices, and vulgar Mistakes*; it is easy to answer, if they are contrary to the Doctrine of our Church, we utterly disown them. We know very well there are Persons, who have so false a Notion of *Popery*, that they charge the Rites and Customs of our

Church with it: but we pitty their Weakneſs and Folly, and are far from defending ſuch Miſrepreſentations. But that which we adhere to, is the Doctrine and Senſe of our Church, as it is by Law eſtabliſhed; and what Repreſentations are made agreeable thereto, I undertake to defend, and no other. But if a Perſon take the liberty to lay on what Colours he pleaſes on one ſide, it will be no hard matter to take them off in the other, and then to ſay, *How much fairer is our Church than ſhe is painted!* It is an eaſy, but not ſo allowable a way of diſputing, for the ſame Perſon to make the Objections and Anſwers too; for he may ſo model and frame the Arguments by a little Art, that the Anſwers may appear very full and ſufficient; whereas if they had been truly repreſented, they would be found very lame and defective.

2. He pretends to give an account why he quotes no Authors for his Miſrepreſentations, which is very unſatisfactory, *viz. That he hath deſcribed the Papiſt therein, exactly according to the apprehenſion he had of him when he was a Proteſtant.* But how can we tell what ſort of Proteſtant he was; nor how well he was inſtructed in his Religion? And muſt the Character now ſuppoſed to be common to Proteſtants, be taken from his ignorant, or childiſh, or wilful Miſtakes? Did ever any Proteſtant that underſtands himſelf, ſay, *That Papiſts are never permitted to hear Sermons which they are able to underſtand,* (p. 58.) *or that they held it lawful to commit Idolatry,* (p. 9.) Or, *that a Papiſt believes the Pope to be his great God, and to be far above all Angels,* &c? Yet theſe are ſome of his Miſrepreſentations, (*p.* 40.) Did he in earneſt think ſo himſelf? If he did, he gives no good account of himſelf: if he did not, he gives a worſe; for then how ſhall we believe him in other things, when he ſaith, *He hath drawn*

hi

his Miſrepreſentations exactly according to his own Apprehenſions. It is true, he ſaith, *he added ſome few Points, which were violently charged on him by his Friends:* but we dare be bold to ſay, this was none of them. But let us ſuppoſe it true, that he had ſuch Apprehenſions himſelf. Are theſe fit to be printed as the Character of a Party? What would they ſay to us, if a Spaniſh Convert ſhould give a Character of *Proteſtants*, according to the common Opinion the People there have of them; and ſet down in one Column their monſtrous Miſrepreſentations, and in another, what he found them to be ſince his coming hither; and that in good Truth he ſaw they were juſt like other Men. But ſuppoſe he had falſe Apprehenſions before he went among them; why did he not take care to inform himſelf better before he changed? Had he no Friends, no Books, no Means to rectify his Miſtakes? Muſt he needs leave one Church, and go to another, before he underſtood either? If this be a true Account of himſelf, it is but a bad Account of the Reaſons of his Change.

3. The Account he gives of the other Part of his Character, affords as little ſatisfaction; For although in the general, it be well that he pretends to keep to a Rule, yet

(1.) He ſhews no Authority he hath to interpret that Rule in his own ſenſe. Now ſeveral of his Repreſentations depend upon his own private Senſe and Opinions, againſt the Doctrine of many others as zealous for their Church as himſelf; and what Reaſon have we to adhere to his Repreſentation, rather than to theirs? As for inſtance, he ſaith, *The Pope's perſonal Infallibility is no Matter of Faith*, (p. 42.) But there are others ſay it is, and is grounded on the ſame Promiſes which makes him Head of the Church. Why now muſt we

take his Repreſentation rather than theirs? And ſo as to the *Depoſing Power*, he grants, *it hath been the Opinion of ſeveral Popes* (and Councils too) *but that it is no Matter of Faith*, (p. 47.) But whoſe Judgment are we to take in this Matter, according to the Principles of their Church? A private Man's, of no Name, no Authority, or of thoſe Popes and Councils who have declared it, and acted by it? And can any Man of their Church juſtify our relying upon his Word, againſt the Declaration of Popes and Councils? But ſuppoſe the Queſtion be about the Senſe of his own Rule, *the Council of Trent*: what Authority hath he to declare it, when the Pope hath expreſly forbidden all Prelats to do it, and reſerved it to the Apoſtolical Sea?

Bulla *Pii 4ti* ſuper Confirm. Concil. Tridentini.

(2.) He leaves out, in the ſeveral Particulars, an eſſential part of the Character of a *Papiſt* ſince the Council of *Trent*; which is, that he doth not only believe the Doctrines there defined to be true, but to be neceſſary to Salvation. And there is not a word of this in his Repreſentation of the Points of Doctrine, but the whole is managed as though there were nothing but a difference about ſome particular Opinions; whereas in Truth, the Neceſſity of holding thoſe Doctrines, in order to Salvation, is the main Point in difference. If Men have no mind to believe their own Senſes, we know not how to help it; but we think it is very hard to be told, we cannot be ſaved unleſs we renounce them too. And this now appears to be the true State of the Caſe, ſince *Pius* the 4*th* drew up and publiſhed a Confeſſion of Faith, according to the Decrees and Canons of the Council of *Trent*, wherein Men are not only required *to believe their Traditions as firmly as the Bible, the ſeven Sacraments, Tranſubſtantiation, the Sacrifice of the Maſs, Purgatory, Invocation of Saints, worſhiping of Images,*

In-

Indulgences, Supremacy, &c. but they must believe, *that without believing these things, there is no Salvation to be had* in the ordinary Way; for after the enumeration of those Points, it follows, *Hanc veram Catholicam Fidem extra quam nemo salvus esse potest*, &c. *This is the true Catholick Faith, without which no Man can be saved*; *i. e.* The belief of these things is thereby declared as necessary to Salvation, as of any other Articles of the Creed. But it may be objected, *The subscribing this Profession of Faith, is not required of all Members of that Church.* To which I answer, That to make a Man a Member of it, he must declare that he holds the same Faith which the Church of *Rome* holds: And this is as much the Faith of the Roman Church, as the Pope and Council of *Trent* could make it. And it is now printed in the Roman *Ritual* at *Paris*, set forth by *Paul* V. as the Confession of Faith owned by the Church of *Rome*. And therefore this ought to have been a Part of the true Representation, as to the Doctrinal Points; but when he comes to the 35*th* Head, he then owns, *That unless Men do believe every Article of the Roman Faith, they cannot be saved*, (p. 96.) *and he that disbelieves one, does in a manner disbelieve all*, (p. 97.) Which may as well reach those who disown the Deposing Power, and the Pope's personal Infallibility, as Us, since those are accounted Articles of Faith by the ruling part of their Church, to whom it chiefly belongs to declare them; and the former hath been defined both by Popes and Councils.

(3.) He never sets down what it is which makes any Doctrine to become a Doctrine of their Church. We are often blamed for charging particular Opinions upon their Church; but we desire to know what it is which makes a Doctrine of their Church; *i. e.* whether frequent and publick Declaration, by the Heads and

and Guides of their Church, be ſufficient or not to that End? Our Author ſeems to imply the Neceſſity of ſome Conditions to be obſerved; for beſides *the Pope's Authority*, he requires *due Circumſtances, and proceeding according to Law*, (p. 42.) But who is to be Judg of theſe Circumſtances and legal Proceedings? And he never tells what theſe *Circumſtances* are. And yet after all, he ſaith, *The Orders of the Supream Paſtor are to be obey'd, whether he be Infallible or not.* And this now brings the Matter home; *The Popes*, he confeſſes, *have owned the Depoſing Doctrine, and acted according to it*: And others are bound to obey their Orders, whether infallible or not; and conſequently they are bound by the Doctrine of their Church to Act, when the Popes ſhall require it, according to the Depoſing Power. But he ſeems to ſay, in this Caſe, that a Doctrine of their Church is to be judged by the Number; for, ſaith he, *There are greater Numbers that diſown this Doctrine*, (p. 47.) I will not at preſent diſpute it; but I deſire to be informed, Whether the Doctrines of their Church go by majority of Votes, or not? I had thought the Authority of the Guides of the Church ought to have over-ballanced any Number of Diſſenters. For, what are thoſe who refuſe to ſubmit to the Dictates of Popes and Councils, but Diſſenters from the Church of *Rome?* The Diſtinction of the *Court & Church of Rome* is wholly impertinent in this Caſe. For, we here conſider not the meer Temporal Power which makes the Court, but the Spiritual Capacity of Teaching the Church: and if Popes and Councils may err in Teaching this Doctrine, why not in any other? I know there are ſome that ſay, *Univerſal Tradition is neceſſary to make a Doctrine of their Church.* But then no ſubmiſſion can be required to any Doctrine in that Church, till the Univerſal Tradition of it, in all Times,

Times, and in all Parts of the Christian Church, be proved. And we need to desire no better Terms than these, as to all Points of Pope *Pius* IV his Creed, which are in dispute between us and them.

(4.) He makes use of the Authority of some particular Divines as delivering the Sense of their Church, when there are so many of greater Authority against them. Whereas, if we proceed by his own Rule, the greater Number is to carry it. Therefore we cannot be thought to Misrepresent them, if we charge them with such things as are owned, either by the general and allowed Practices of their Church, or their Publick Offices, or the generality of their Divines and Casuists; or in case of a Contest, with that side which is owned by the Guides of their Church, when the other is censured; or which was approved by their Canonized Saints, or declared by their Popes and Councils, whose Decrees they are bound to follow. And by these Measures I intend to proceed, having no design to *misrepresent them*, as indeed we need not.

And so much in Answer to the *Introduction*.

I. *Of Praying to Images.*

IN this, and the other Particulars, where it is neceſſary, I ſhall obſerve this Method;

1. To give a clear and impartial Account of the State of the Controverſy in as few Words as I can.

2. To make ſome Reflections on what he ſaith, in order to the clearing them from Miſrepreſentations.

As to the State of this Controverſy, as it ſtands, ſince the Council of *Trent*, we are to conſider.

1. We muſt diſtinguiſh between what Perſons do in their own Opinion, and what they do according to the Senſe of the Divine Law. It is poſſible that Men may intend one thing, and the Law give another Senſe of it: as is often ſeen in the Caſe of Treaſon; although the Perſons plead never ſo much they had no intention to commit Treaſon, yet if the Law makes their Act to be ſo, their diſavowing it, doth not Excuſe them. So it is in the preſent Caſe; Men may have real and ſerious Intentions, to refer their final, ultimate, and Soveraign Worſhip only to God; but if the Law of God ſtrictly and ſeverely prohibits this particular Manner of Worſhip by Images, in as full, plain, and clear Words as may be, and gives a Denomination to ſuch Acts, taken from the immediate Object of it; no particular Intention of the Perſons can alter that Denomination, or make the Guilt to be leſs than the Law makes it.

2. There can be no *Miſrepreſenting* as to the lawfulneſs of many External Acts of Worſhip, with Reſpect to Images, which are owned by them. But it doth not look

look fairly to put the Title, *Of Praying to Images*; for the Queſtion is, *about the Worſhip of Images:* whereas this Title would inſinuate, as though we did directly charge them with *Praying to their Images, without any farther Reſpect.* Which we are ſo far from charging them with, that I do not know of any People in the World, who are not like *Stones and Stocks* themſelves, who are liable to that Charge. The *PENDETS* in the *Eaſt-Indies* are fully cleared from it, by *Thevenot*, as well as *Bernier*. And it would be hard we ſhould not allow the ſame to our Fellow-Chriſtians. I do therefore grant what our Author ſaith, *viz. That all the veneration they expreſs before Images, whether by kneeling, praying, lifting up the Eys, burning Candles, Incenſe, &c. is not at all done for the Image, but is wholly referr'd to the things repreſented, which he intends to honour by theſe Actions.* But I hope now, it is no Miſrepreſenting for us to ſay, that *they do kneel, pray, lift up their Eyes, burn Candles, Incenſe, &c. before their Images*; which is all I charge them with at preſent.

Thevenot *Voyage des Indes. p.* 188. Bernier *Memoirs. Tom.* 3. *p.* 172. Pag. 3.

3. To perform theſe Acts before Images, without a Deſign to worſhip the Images by them, is declared, by great Divines of the Church of *Rome*, to be next to Hereſy. The Caſe was this; there were before the Council of *Trent*, ſeveral Perſons who lived in Communion of that Church, but by no means approved the Worſhip of Images, ſuch as *Durandus*, *Holcot*, *Picus Mirandula*, and others. Now theſe Perſons thought fit to comply in theſe External Acts, but declared they intended not to worſhip the Images, but the Objects before them. Since the Council of *Trent* decreed Images were to be worſhiped, this Caſe hath been debated by the Divines and Caſuiſts of greateſt Reputation among them; And *Suarez* ſaith, *this Way of Durandus, is dangerous, raſh, and ſavours of Hereſy*; and he

Suarez *in* 3. *part. Qu.* 25. *Diſp.* 53.

 ſaith

Sect. 3. 2do. principaliter. & Sect. 5. ſaith further from *Medina, that it was* Victoria's *Opinion, that it was Heretical*; but he adds, that his own Opinion, *that Images were truly and properly to be Worſhipped, was generally received by their Divines*; and therefore I need name no more.

4. It is granted by their Divines and Caſuiſts, that the People in the Worſhip of Images may eaſily fall into Idolatry.

1. If the Worſhip do not paſs from the Image to the thing repreſented. And ſo *Aquinas* himſelf determins, that no irrational Creature is capable of Worſhip, but as it hath Reſpect to a Rational Being. But here lies the Difficulty, how an extrinſical Relation to an Object of Worſhip, where the thing is confeſſed to deſerve none, can give any Reaſon, for its being properly worſhipped. But they all grant, if the Worſhip ſtop at the Inanimate Part, it can be no other than the Worſhip of Stocks and Stones.

Bellarmin. *de Imag. l. 2. c. 24.* 2. If the Worſhip be given to the Image, which is proper to God alone. This *Bellarmin* is forced to grant, becauſe the Evidence is ſo clear in Antiquity, that the Gnoſticks were condemned for ſome Worſhip which they performed to the Image of Chriſt. Now, we cannot think that theſe Gnoſticks were ſuch Sots, as to take the Image of Chriſt to be Chriſt himſelf; and therefore whatever Worſhip it was, it muſt be Relative, *i. e.* given to the Image for the ſake of Chriſt repreſented by it.

Concil. Trident. Seſſ. 25. 3. *If the People believe any Divinity to be in the Images, or put any Truſt or Confidence in them,* then the Council of *Trent* it ſelf owns ſuch to be like the Heathen Idolaters. Now, how ſhall it be known when the People believe Divinity to be in Images, but by ſome more than ordinary Preſence or Operation in or by them? by their having a greater Opinion of one Image than

than of another of the ſame Perſon? by their going long Pilgrimages to certain Images in hopes of Relief, when they might eaſily cauſe Images to repreſent at home?

And that ſuch are no extravagant Imaginations, is known to all who have heard of *Loretto*, or *Compoſtella*, or other Places nearer home. I need not mention the Complaints of *Polydore Virgil*, *Caſſander*, or *Wicelius* to this purpoſe, who died all in the Communion of the Church of *Rome*; for the ſame is very lately complained of by a conſiderable Perſon in that Communion, who ſaith, *The greateſt part of the Devotion of the People of* Italy, Spain, *and* Portugal, *conſiſts in proſtrating themſelves before Images, and going in Pilgrimage to them, and hoping for Remiſſion of their Sins by ſo doing.* And another very lately yields, *That to avoid the Peril of Idolatry, to which,* he ſaith, *the People is evidently expoſed by the uſe of Images, it would be neceſſary to take them away from the Altars, and by no means to have them allowed for the Objects of Religious Worſhip.*

Moyens Surs & honeſtes pour la Converſion de tous les Heretiques. To. 2. p. 115.

Entretiens de Philalethe & Philerene. 2d Part. p. 157.

The Queſtion now is, Whether the Council of *Trent* hath taken any effectual Courſe to prevent theſe *Abuſes?* If not, what *Miſrepreſenting* is it to charge the Abuſes upon the Doctrines and Practices allowed by it?

The Remedies preſcribed by the Council, are theſe;

1. *Declaring that there is no Divinity or Vertue in them for which they ſhould be worſhipped; and that nothing is to be deſired of them, nor any Truſt or Confidence to be put in them.*

2. *Expreſſing their earneſt deſire, that if any Abuſes have crept in, they may be removed.*

But in the mean time the Council decrees, *the Images not only to be useful to be set up in Churches, but to have due Honour and Worship given them there, for the sake of those they represent; as not only putting off the Hat, but falling down before them.* And the *Roman Catechism* declares, *That this Worship is very beneficial to the People, and so much is to be told them; and that Images are to be in Churches, not meerly for Instruction, sed ut colantur,* that they may be worshipped.

Catechis. Rom. Part. 3. c. 2. §. 14.

But what could the Council do more, than to desire all Abuses may be taken away; and is it not then the fault of others, and not of the Council if they be not?

I grant, the Council doth desire *Abuses may be taken away, if any such be*; but then it enumerates those Abuses, in *Heterodox Images, in making Gain of Images, in painting them too wantonly*; but besides, it doth say, *that all Superstition be removed in the Sacred Use of Images*; but it doth not say in *the Worship of them*; and so it may relate to *Magick* and *Divination*. But that the Council could not prevent, or design to prevent the *Abuses* mention'd in the Worship of Images, will appear by these things.

1. The Council of *Trent* allows the highest Relative Worship to be given to them; it setting no bounds to it, so it be for the sake of the Prototypes.

2. It allows a Worship to be given to the Images themselves too; for it confirms the second Council of *Nice*, which decreed an inferiour Adoration to be given to them.

3. It disapproves no Customs then practised among them in the Worship of Images; which were all known, and by many complained of, both as Pilgrimages to them, and the carrying of them about in Procession, and the solemn Consecration of them; the Form whereof is not only inserted, but inlarged in the new Ponti-

Pontifical ſince the Council of *Trent*. And it is to be obſerved, that in the old Pontifical, *A. D.* 1511. there is no Form for conſecrating an Image; in that of *Paul* the 3*d*, it is inſerted, but out of *Durandus*; but in that of *Clement* the 8*th*, it is put in more largely, and as authentically as if it had been always there. And is not this the way to reform the Worſhip of Images?

To come now to our Author's Reflections on the *Miſrepreſentation* he ſaith hath been made as to this Point.

1. *A Papiſt repreſented, believes it damnable to worſhip Stocks and Stones for Gods; to pray to Pictures or Images of Chriſt, the Virgin* Mary, *or any other Saints.*

Theſe Expreſſions are capable of a double ſenſe, and therefore this is not fair Repreſenting.

(1.) *To worſhip Stocks or Stones for Gods*, may ſignify two things. (1.) To believe the very Stocks and Stones to be Gods. And this we do not charge them with. (2.) To give to Images made of Wood and Stone, the Worſhip due only to God; and ſo by conſtruction of the Fact, to make them *Gods*, by giving them *Divine Worſhip*. And if they will clear themſelves of this, they muſt either prove that *external Adoration* is no part of Divine Worſhip, (notwithſtanding the Scripture makes it ſo, and all the reſt of Mankind look upon it as ſuch, even Jews, Turks, and Infidels) or that their external Adoration hath no reſpect to the Images (which is contrary to the Council of *Trent*) or that Divine Worſhip being due to the Being Repreſented, it may be likewiſe given to the Image. And how then could the Gnoſticks be condemned for giving Divine Worſhip to the Image of Chriſt, which *Bellarmine* confeſſes; and is affirmed by *Irenæus*, *Epiphanius*, S. *Auguſtin*, and *Damaſcen*?

(2.) *To*

(2.) *To pray to Images of Christ, or the blessed Virgin*, may likewise be taken in two senses. (1.) To pray to them, so as to expect to be heard by the meer Images, and so we do not charge them with it. (2.) To pray to them, so as to expect to be rather heard by themselves for praying to them by their Images. And if this be not so, to what end are the Prayers made in the Consecration of Images, for those that shall pray before them? To what purpose do so many go in long Pilgrimages to certain Images, if they do not hope to be better heard for praying there?

But he goes on, 2. *He keeps them by him indeed, to keep in his mind the memory of the things represented by them.* And is this all in good Truth? We will never quarrel with them, if this be true Representing. No, that he dares not say.

But, 3. *He is taught to use them*, p. 2. But how? *by casting his Eye upon the Pictures or Images, and thence to raise his heart to the Prototypes.* And is this all yet? No.

But, 4. He finds a double conveniency in the use of them. (1.) *They represent at one glance*; and Men may easily make *good* Reflections, as *upon the sight of a Death's Head, or old* Time *painted with his Forelock, Hour-glass*, and *Syth.* And will he undertake, that Images shall be used in Churches for no other End? Was the Picture of old *Time* ever *Consecrated*, or placed upon the *Altar*, or elsewhere, *that it might be worshipped?* as the *Roman Catechism* speaks of their Images. (2.) *They cure Distractions; for they call back his wandring Thoughts to the right Object.* What is this *Right Object?* the Image, or the Person represented? And that must be either a Creature, or God himself. If it be a Creature, doth not this imply that it is made a *Right Object of Worship?* If God himself, how doth an Image cure our Distraction, in the Worship of an

Infinite

Infinite Inviſible Being; when the very Image is moſt apt to diſtract our thoughts, by drawing them down from his Divine and Adorable Perfections, to the groſs and mean Repreſentations of an Image. But are we yet come to the utmoſt uſe of them? No.

But, 5. *He cannot but love, honour, and reſpect the Images themſelves, for the ſake of thoſe they repreſent.* Will this content them? And will he promiſe to go no further? It is hard to part upon Terms of meer *Reſpect and Decent Regard*, where there is no encroachment upon *Divine Worſhip*. And here we are at a ſtand.

But he goes further. 6. And ſo he is come at laſt, *to veneration before Images.* And is this all? Dares he deny *veneration to Images?* When the Council of *Trent* hath determined it. *Eiſq; venerationem impartiendam.* What is this veneration *before Images* only? *Bellarmine* hath a Chapter on purpoſe to prove, that *true and proper Worſhip is to be given to Images.* And was he a *Miſrepreſenter? Suarez* ſaith, *It is an Article of Faith, that Worſhip is to be given to them.* But if the Veneration be only before them, why are they Conſecrated, and ſet up in Places proper for Adoration?

But, 7. *To ſatisfy any one that he is far from making Gods of his Images, he is ready to break them into a thouſand pieces.* What, a Conſecrated Image? Dares he take a Crucifix from the Altar and tear it in pieces? This doth not look like *the Love, Honour, and Reſpect* he mentioned before, not to name *Veneration.* And I am afraid this is a ſtrain beyond true Repreſenting: Yet at length he hath found ſome pretty Parallels for the *veneration of Images* themſelves; and ſo we are come at laſt to the main Point. But this is not directly owned; yet in the way of his Repreſenting, it is fairly inſinuated by his Parallels.

1. *A Christian loves and honours his Neighbour, because he bears the Image of God in his Soul.* But doth he therefore take him and set him before him when he kneels at his Devotion, to raise his Mind, and cure his Distractions? Would he set him upon the Altar, and burn Incense before him, because of the Image of God in him? Is there no difference between the *Object of Christian Love*, and of *Divine Worship?* Nor between a Spiritual Invisible Divine Image in the Souls of Men, and a Material and Corporeal Representation?

2. *We may kiss and esteem the Bible, because it contains and represents to Us God's Word.* But when we kiss and esteem the Bible, we remember the Second Commandment is in it; and we dare not break his Law, when we pretend to honour his Word. But we think there is some difference between *Reverence* and *Respect* to the *Bible*, and *falling down* before an Image. The Circumstances of the one declare it to be meer *Respect*, and a *Religious Decency*; and if the other be not *external Adoration*, we know not what it is.

3. *A good Preacher is loved, because he minds Men of their Duty.* But what should we say to him that should therefore *kneel down and say his Prayers, and burn Candles and Incense before him*, out of a respect to his good Doctrine? Did S. *Peter*, or S. *Paul* like this, when Men would have worshipped them? A good Preacher would tell them of their Duty, as they did; and take Men off from the Worship of any Creature, animate or inanimate, and direct them to worship God alone, who made Heaven and Earth.

II. *Of*

II. *Of Worſhipping Saints.*

FOr the clear ſtating this Controverſy, theſe things are to be premiſed.

1. We do not charge them, *that they make Gods of dead Men, i. e.* that they believe the Saints to be Independent Deities. For this our Author confeſſes *were a moſt damnable Idolatry.*

2. We do not ſay, that the State of the Church of *Rome*, with reſpect to the Worſhip of dead Men, is as bad as Heatheniſm. For we acknowledg the true Saints and Martyrs to have been, not only Good and Vertuous, but extraordinary Perſons, in great Favour with God, and highly deſerving our Eſteem and Reverence as well as Imitation; whereas the Heathen Deified Men, were vile and wicked Men, and deſerved not the common Eſteem of Mankind, according to the Accounts themſelves give of them. And we own the common Doctrine and Advantages of Chriſtianity to be preſerved in the Church of *Rome*.

3. We do not deny, that they do allow ſome external Acts of Worſhip to be ſo proper to God alone, that they ought to be given to none elſe beſides him. And this they call *Latria*; and we ſhall never diſpute with them about the proper ſignification of a Word, when the Senſe is agreed, unleſs they draw Inferences from it, which ought not to be allowed. To this *Latria*, they refer not only Sacrifice, but all that relates to it, as Temples, Altars, and Prieſts: ſo that by their own Confeſſion, to make theſe immediately and properly to the Honour of any Saint, is to make a God of that Saint, and to commit Idolatry.

4. They confeſs, that to pray to Saints to beſtow Spiritual or Temporal Gifts upon us, were to give to them the Worſhip proper to God, who is the only Giver of all good things. For elſe I do not underſtand, why they ſhould take ſo much pains to let us know, that whatever the Forms of their Prayers and Hymns are, yet the Intention and Spirit of the Church, is only to deſire them to pray for us, and to obtain things for us by their Interceſſion with God.

But two things cannot be denied by them.

1. That they do uſe ſolemn Invocation of Saints in Places of Divine Worſhip, at the ſame time they make their Addreſſes to God himſelf withal the Circumſtances of External Adoration, with bended Knees and Eyes lifted up to Heaven; and that this Practice is according to the Council *Trent*, which not only decrees a humble Invocation of them, but declares it to be impiety to condemn mental and vocal Supplication to the Saints in Heaven. Sect. 25.

2. That they do own making the Saints in Heaven to be their Mediators of Interceſſion, but not of Redemption; although Chriſt be our Mediator in both ſenſes.

And upon theſe two Points, this Controverſy depends.

Let us now ſee what our Repreſenter ſaith to them.

1. *His Church teaches him indeed, and he believes that it is good and profitable to deſire the Interceſſion of the Saints reigning with Chriſt in Heaven; but that they are either Gods, or his Redeemers, he is no where taught, but deteſts all ſuch Doctrine.* Pag. 4.

There are two Ways of *deſiring the Interceſſion of others for us.*

1. By

1. By way of *Friendly Requeſt*, as an Act of mutual Charity; and ſo, no doubt, we may deſire others here on Earth to pray for us.

2. By way of *humble Supplication*, with all the external Acts of Adoration: and we cannot think S. *Peter*, or S. *Paul*, who refuſed any thing like *Adoration* from Men, would have been pleaſed to have ſeen Men fall down upon their Knees before them; and in the ſame poſture of Devotion in which they were praying to Almighty God, to put their Names into the middle of their *Litanies*, and ſo pray them then to pray for them.

But how are we ſure that their Church teaches no more than this? I have read over and over the Council of *Trent*, and the *Roman Catechiſm* about it, and I can find no ſuch limitation of their ſenſe there, where, if if any where, it ought to be found. The Council of *Trent* mentions both the Prayers, and the Help and Aſſiſtance of the Saints which they are to fly to. If this Help and Aſſiſtance be no more than their Prayers, why is it mentioned as diſtinct? Why is their reigning together with Chriſt in Heaven ſpoken of, but to let us underſtand they have a Power to Help and Aſſiſt? For what is their Reigning to their Praying for us? But I have a further Argument to prove the Council meant more, *viz.* the Council knew the common Practices and Forms of Invocation then uſed and allowed, and the general Opinion, that the Saints had power to Help and Aſſiſt thoſe who prayed to them. If the Council did not approve this, why did it inſert the very words upon which that Practice was grounded? They likewiſe very well knew the Complaints which had been made of theſe things; and ſome of their own Communion cried ſhame upon ſome of their Hymns. *Wiceli-us* ſaith, one of them, *Salve Regina, &c.* is full of

wicel. *in Enchiridio Abuſuum.*

downright Impiety, and horrible Superſtition, and that others are wholly inexcuſable. *Lud. Vives* had ſaid, *He found little difference in the Peoples Opinion of their Saints in many things, from what the Heathens had of their Gods.* Theſe things were known, and it was in their Power to have redreſſed them, by declaring what the ſenſe of the Council was, and that whatever Forms were uſed, no more was to be underſtood by them, but *praying to them to pray for them.* Beſides, the Council of *Trent*, in the very ſame Seſſion, took care *about Reforming the Miſſal and Breviary*; why was no care taken to Reform theſe *Prayers and Hymns*, which they ſay are not to be conſtrued by *the Senſe of the Words*, but by *the Senſe of the Church?* There was time enough taken for doing it; for the *Reformed Miſſal* was not publiſhed till ſix Years after the *Council*, nor the *Breviary* till four. In all that time, the *Prayers and Hymns* might eaſily have been altered to the *Senſe of the Church*, if that were truly ſo. But inſtead of that, a very late French Writer cries out *of the neceſſity of Reforming the Breviaries as to theſe things*; wherein he confeſſes, *Many Hymns are ſtill remaining, wherein thoſe things are asked of Saints, which ought to be asked of God alone; as being delivered from the Chains of our Sins, being preſerved from ſpiritual Maladies and Hell Fire; being inflamed with Charity, and made fit for Heaven. In good Conſcience,* ſaith he, *is not this joining the Saints with God himſelf, to ask thoſe things of them which God alone can give?* And whatever Men talk of *the Senſe of the Church*, he confeſſes, *the very Forms, and natural Senſe of the Words, do raiſe another Idea in Mens Minds; which ought to be prevented.*

Vives in Aug. de Civit. Dei, l. 8. c. 27.

Entretiens de Philalethe & Philerene. Part 2. p. 160, 163, 165.

But doth not the Roman Catechiſm explain this to be the ſenſe of the Church? I have examined that too, with all the care I could, about this Matter. And I

cannot

cannot find any Neceſſity from thence of putting this Senſe upon them. I grant in one place, where it explains *the difference of the Invocation of God and Saints*, it ſaith, *We are to pray to God as the Giver, and to Saints that they would obtain things of God for us*; and then it adds, *the Forms differ, that to God* is *Miſerere Nobis* and *Audi Nos*; that to Saints is, *Ora pro Nobis*. Very well! And is there then no other Form owned or allowed in the Church of *Rome* to Saints beſides this? Hold a little, ſaith the *Catechiſm*, for *it is lawful to make uſe of another Form*; and that is, *we may pray to Saints too, Ut noſtri miſereantur*. And how doth this now differ from that to God, but only in Number? But it adds, *that the Saints are very pittiful*; then ſurely we are encouraged to pray to them for *help and pitty*. *Tes*, ſaith the *Catechiſm*, *we may pray to them, that being moved with pity towards us, they would help us with their Favour and Interceſſion with God*. But yet this doth not clear the Matter; for elſewhere the *Roman Catechiſm* attributes more to *Saints* than meer *Intereceſſion*; and we may pray to them for what is in their Power: For where it undertakes to give an exact Account of the Reaſon of *Invocation* of *Saints and Angels*; it there parallels them with *Magiſtrates under a King*; and ſaith, *they are God's Miniſters in governing the Church*; *Invocandi itaque ſunt quod & perpetuo Deum intuentur, & Patrocinium Salutis noſtræ libentiſſimè ſuſcipiunt*. What is this *Patrocinium ſalutis noſtræ*? Is it only *Praying and Interceſſion with God*? That cannot be, for it inſtances preſently in *deliverances by Angels, and* Jacob's *praying to the Angel to bleſs him*, and not meerly to intercede for him. *But though this is ſpoken of Angels*, yet from hence it infers the *Invocation of Saints* too. But what need we inſiſt more on this, ſince they do own the *Miniſtry of Saints* as well as Angels, with reſpect

Catech. Rom. Part 4. *c.* 6. *n.* 2, 3.

Catech. Rom. Part 3. *c.* 2. *n.* 4, 6. *Cum præſint nobis Sancti & rerum noſtrarum curam gerant.* Bellarm. de Sanct. Beatit. *l.* 1. *c.* 20. §. *deinde. Non ſolum ab Angelis ſed etiam à ſpiritibus beatorum hominum Regi & Gubernari fideles rivents. Id. ib. c.* 18. §. *nos autem.*

spect to the Church; and do *Canonize Saints* for particular Countries, as lately *S. Rosa* for *Peru*. And where there is such a particular Protection supposed, what incongruity is it to interpret the Form of their Prayers, according to a Doctrine so received and allowed? But of this more under the next Head.

2. *He confesses that we are all redeemed by the Blood of Christ alone, and that he is our only Mediator of Redemption; but as for Mediators of Intercession, he doth not doubt but it is acceptable with God we should have many.*

I would ask concerning this Distinction, the Question which *Christ* asked concerning *John*'s *Baptism*, *Is it from Heaven, or of Man?* No doubt there may be such a Distinction of *Mediators*, if God please to make them. But who hath Authority to appoint *Mediators* with him besides himself? Is it not usurping his Prerogative, to appoint the great Officers of his Kingdom for him? Would any Prince upon Earth allow this, *viz.* when he hath absolutely declared his Pleasure, that his own Son should present Petitions to him, that others shall take upon them to set up Masters of Requests themselves? Can any thing be plainer in the New Testament, than that God hath appointed the *Mediator* of *Redemption*, to be our *Mediator* of *Intercession*? And that his *Intercession* is founded upon his *Redemption*. As the *High Priest*'s going into the *Holy of Holies* to intercede for the People, was upon the *Blood of the Sacrifice* of *Expiation*, which he carried in with him. If there were no Revelation in this Matter, there might be some reason for it. But since the Revelation is so clear in it, this Distinction looks just like the *Socinians* Distinction of a *God by Nature*, and a *God by Office*; which was framed on purpose to avoid the plain Texts of Scripture which called Christ *God*.

John 14. 13, 14, 16, 23, 24. Heb. 7. 25. & 9. 7, 24. 1 Jo. 2. 1.

So doth this look as if it were intended to avoid that clear Text, which saith, *There is but one Mediator between God and Man, the Man Christ Jesus.* Which is presently answered with this Distinction; although there be not the least ground in that or any other Text for it: 1 Tim. 2. 5.

Yes, saith our Author, Moses *was such a Mediator for the Israelites*; Job *for his three Friends*; Stephen *for his Persecutors*: *The Romans were desired by S.* Paul *to be his Mediator, and the* Corinthians *and* Ephesians; *so almost every sick Person desires the Congregation to be his Mediator, that is, to be remembred in their Prayers*, p. 4, 5.

But is there no difference between Men praying for one another, and desiring others to pray for them here on Earth, and an *humble Invocation* of the *Saints in Heaven* to be our *Mediators* of *Intercession* with God there? There is a threefold disparity in the Case.

1. Here upon Earth we converse with one another as Fellow-Creatures, and there is no danger of our having an Opinion thereby, that we are able to assist one another any other way than by our Prayers. But the Case is very different as to the Saints in Heaven, who by being addressed to there by such solemn Invocation, may too easily be conceived to have the Power of bestowing such Blessings upon those who call upon them.

2. Heaven is looked on by all Mankind who direct their Devotions thither, as the particular Throne of God, where he dwells, and discovers himself after another manner than he doth upon the Earth. And we are directed to pray to our *Father in Heaven*; where he is represented as infinitely above all his Creatures; and the great Contentment of Religion is, to keep up the apprehension of this distance between him and them.

Now

Now it is hardly possible to keep it up, if in the Publick Offices of Religion, in the solemnest postures of Devotion, with Eyes lifted up to Heaven, they do make Addresses, both to God and to his Creatures.

3. Men are sure, when they pray to others on Earth, to pray for them, that they do no more than they can justify in point of Discretion, when they speak or write to those that can understand what their desire is; but no Man on Earth can be certain that the Saints in Heaven can do it: For it is agreed they cannot do it without Revelation, and no Man can be assured there is a Revelation; and it is not reasonable to expect it; for they pray to Saints to pray to God for them; and they cannot tell what they pray for, unless God to whom they are to pray, reveal to them what it is they must pray to him for. Is it not then the better, the safer, the wiser way, to make our Prayers to him, who we are sure is able to hear and help us; and hath promised to grant what we ask in his Son's Name? But there is no other Name, either under Heaven, or in Heaven, whereby we can be saved, or our Prayers accepted, but His alone.

But our Author saith, *It is no part of his Faith, how the Saints in Heaven know the Prayers and Necessities of such who address themselves to them*, p. 5.

But how comes it to be any part of his Faith, that they know them? *However he doth not doubt but God can never want means of letting the Saints know them*, p. 6. And is this a sufficient ground for solemn Invocation of Saints? God doth not want Means to let the Emperor of *Japan* know a Request any one here hath to make to him; but is this a reasonable Ground, for him at this distance to make it to him? God doth not want Means to let the Pope know what a mighty Service it would be to the Christian World, to make a wise and truly

truly Christian-Reformation in the Church; but would this be a Ground sufficient for me at this Distance, to make a Speech to him about it? I knew a Man who understood not a word of Latin, but yet would needs go hear a Latin Sermon: some asked him afterwards, what he meant by it? and the chief Reason he gave was much like this, *God did not want Means to let him know what the Preacher meant.*

But after all, Suppose *God should make known to the Saints what is desired of them*; I ask, Whether this be sufficient Ground for solemn Invocation? When *Socinus* was not able to defend the Invocation of Christ himself, supposing that he could know our Hearts only by Revelation. And he had nothing material to say, but only that there was a Command for it; which can never be so much as pretended in this Case.

As to what he alleadges of *the Elders falling down before the Lamb, having Vials full of Odours, which are the Prayers of the Saints, Apoc.* 5. 8. It must be strained hard to be brought to this purpose, when both Ancient and Modern Interpreters take it for a Representation of what was done upon Earth, and not in Heaven. And if it were in Heaven, Prophetical Visions were never intended for a Measure of our Duties. *If the Angels do pray for mankind*, Zech. 1. 12. Doth it therefore follow we must pray to them? But we say as the Angel did to S. *John*, Revel. 19. 10. in a like Case; *See thou do it not: worship God.*

III. *Of Addreſſing more Supplications to the Virgin* Mary, *than to Chriſt.*

HEre is no need of farther ſtating the Queſtion; this only relating to the extraordinary Service of the Bleſſed Virgin. And therefore we are preſently to attend his Motions.

He believes it damnable to think the Virgin Mary *more powerful in Heaven than Chriſt, or that ſhe can in any thing command him,* p. 6.

But in good earneſt, Is it not damnable, unleſs a Man thinks the Bleſſed Virgin *more powerful than Chriſt?* Suppoſe one ſhould think her to have *an equal ſhare of Power with Chriſt*; Is this damnable, or not? Is it not ſetting up a Creature equal with God?

But what thinks he then of thoſe who have attributed an univerſal Dominion to her, over Angels, Men, and Devils? What thinks he not only of Pſalters, but of a Creed, Litany, and all the Hymns of Scripture being applied to her? All which was done by a Canonized Saint in their Church; and the Books printed out of the *Vatican* Manuſcripts, and dedicated to the Pope. And there we find ſomething more than an *Ora pro nobis* in the *Litany*; for there is *Parce nobis Domina*, Spare us, Good Lady: and *ab omni malo, libera nos Domina*: From all Evil, Good Lady, deliver us.

S. Bonavent. *Opuſc. Tom.* 1. *ad fin.*

S. Bernardin. *Ser. apud Bernardin. à Buſtis Marial.* Part. 12. Serm. 2.

What thinks he of another Canonized Saint, who ſaid, theſe two Propoſitions are both true, *All things are ſubject to God's Command, even the Virgin*; and *All things are ſubject to the Command of the Virgin, even God.* Was this damnable in a Canonized Saint?

What

What thinks he of the noted Hymn?

O felix Puerpera nostra pians scelera
Jure Matris impera Redemptori!

Was not this damnable? And I have not only seen it in the *old Paris Missal*, but *Balinghem* a Jesuit saith, it was in the Missals of *Tournay*, *Liege*, *Amiens*, *Artois*, and the *Old Roman*. I could produce many other Passages cited by him out of the *old Offices* to the same purpose; but I forbear.

Balinghem. *Parnass. Marine* p. 268.

But I cannot omit the Approbation given to the blaspemous saying of S. *Bernardin* by *Mendoza*, (who endeavours to prove *the blessed Virgin's Kingdom, not to be a Metaphorical, but a true and real Kingdom*). And by *Salazar*, another noted Jesuit, who saith, *Her Kingdom is as large as her Sons*. And we have lately seen how far this Divinity is spread, for not many Years since, this Proposition was sent from *Mexico*;

Mendoza. *Virid. Sacr. l.* 2. Probl. 1, & 4.

Salazar *pro Immac. Concept.* c. 32.

Filius non tantum tenetur audire Matrem, sed & obedire;

Hier. Peres de Nueros Lapidicina Sacra Tr. 1. Sect. 12. N. 148.

The Son is bound, not only to hear, but to obey his Mother. And is it still damnable for to say, *she commands him?*

But our Author saith, What ever esteem they have for her, *They own her still as a Creature*. Is he sure of that? What thinks he of another Saying, which *Mendoza* approves of, *viz.* of Christ's saying to his Mother, *As thou hast communicated Humanity to me, I will communicate my Deity to thee*. But it may be said, *We are by no means to judg the sense of a Church by some Mens extravagant sayings*. I grant it; but I have something considerable to reply; *viz.* That we may easily judg

Pag. 7.

Viridar. Sacr. l. 2. Probl. 2. N. 11.

 which

which way the Guides of that Church incline by this following paſſage. About ten years ſince a Gentleman of that Communion publiſhed a Book, called, *Wholſome Advice to the Worſhippers of the bleſſed Virgin*; and the whole deſign of it, being printed in Latin and French, was to bring the People of that Church to a bare *Ora pro nobis* to the *Bleſſed Virgin*. But this was ſo far from being approved, that the Book was condemned at *Rome*, and vehemently oppoſed by the *Jeſuits* in *France*; and a whole Volumn publiſhed againſt it.

La veritable Devotion envers la S. vierge Etable & Defendu par le Pere Craſſet à Paris A. D. 1679.

Here I have reaſon to enquire, Whether the Virgin *Mary* then, according to the ſenſe of the Church of *Rome*, be only a *Mediatrix* of *Interceſſion* or not, ſince ſo large Power and Dominion is attributed to her? And why ſhould not her Suppliants go beyond an *Ora pro nobis*, if this Doctrine be received; as it muſt be, if the contrary cannot be endured? For that Author allowed her *Interceſſion, and Prayer to her* on that account; but he found fault with thoſe who ſaid *ſhe had a Kingdom divided with her Son*; *that ſhe was the Mother of Mercy, or was a Co-Saviour, or Co-Redemptrix*; *or that ſhe was to be worſhipped with* Latria; *or that Men were to be Slaves to her*. Now, if theſe things muſt not be touched without Cenſure, and no Cenſure paſs on the other Books; is it not eaſy to judg, which is more agreeable to the Spirit of the Guides of that Church?

Monita Salutaria B. V. Mariæ ad Cultores ſuos indiſcretos §. 3. n. 56. §. 4.

But we have a freſh Inſtance of this kind at home, in a Book very lately publiſhed; *Permiſſu Superiorum*. There we are told in the Epiſtle, That not only *the Bleſſed Virgin is the Empreſs of Seraphims — the moſt exact Original of Practical Perfection which the Omnipotency of God ever drew*; *but that by innumerable Titles ſhe claims the utmoſt Duty of every Chriſtian, as a proper Homage to her Greatneſs*. What can be ſaid more of the Son of God in our Nature? In the Book it ſelf ſhe is ſaid

Contemplations of the Life and Glory of Holy *Mary*, the Mother of Jeſus, *A. D.* 1685.

Pag. 4.

to

to be Queen of Angels, Patroneſs of the Church, Advocate of Sinners; that the Power of *Mary* in the Kingdom of Jeſus, is ſuitable to her Maternity, and other Priviledges of Grace; and therefore by it ſhe juſtly claims a Servitude from all pure Creatures. But wherein doth this ſpecial Devotion to her conſiſt? He names ſeveral Particulars. Pag. 8.

1. In having an inward, cordial and paſſionate value of the Maternity of *Mary*, and all other Excellencies proper to, and inſeparable from the Mother of God.

2. In External Acts of Worſhip, of eminent Servitude towards her, by reaſon of the Amplitude of her Power in the Empire of Jeſus. And can we imagine theſe ſhould go no farther, than a poor *Ora pro Nobis?* He inſtances in theſe External Acts of her Worſhip. (1.) *Frequent viſiting holy Places dedicated to her Honour.* And are not thoſe her Temples then? which *Bellarmin* confeſſes to be a peculiar part of the Worſhip due to God. And the Diſtinction of *Baſilicæ* cannot hold here: becauſe he believes the Aſſumption of the B. Virgin; and he will not pretend *to her Honour* is only for Diſcrimination. (2.) A ſpecial Reverence towards Images repreſenting her Perſon. (3.) Performing ſome daily Devotions containing her Praiſes, congratulating her Excellency, or imploring her Mediation; and by oft calling upon the Sacred Name of holy *Mary*, &c. *Billarmin. de Cultu. Sanct. l. 3. c. 4. iniſ.*

3. In having a firm and unſhaken Confidence in her Patronage amidſt the greateſt of our inward Conflicts, and outward Tribulations; through a ſtrong Judgment of her eminent Power within the Empire of Jeſus, grounded upon the ſingular Prerogative of her Divine Maternity. I have not Patience to tranſcribe more, but refer the Reader to the Book it ſelf; only the eighth Particular of ſpecial Devotion is ſo remarkable, that it ought

ought not to be paſſed over, *viz. Entring a ſolemn Co-*
Pag. 12. *venant with Holy* Mary, *to be for ever her Servant, Cli-*
ent and Devote under ſome ſpecial Rule, Society or
Form of Life, and thereby dedicating our Perſons,
Concerns, Actions, and all the Moments and Events
of our Life to Jeſus, under the Protection of his Di-
vine Mother, chooſing her to be our Adoptive Mother,
Patroneſs and Advocate; and entruſting her with what
we are, have, do or hope, in Life, Death, and through
all Eternity. And is all this no more than an *Ora pro*
Pag. 14. *Nobis?* And it follows, *Put your ſelf wholly under her*
Protection. What a pitiful thing was the old *Collyridi-*
an Cake, in compariſon of theſe ſpecial Acts of Devoti-
on to her! But there are ſome extraordinary ſtrains of
Devotion afterwards, which it is pity to paſs over. As,
I will ever obſerve thee as my Soveraign Lady, Adop-
Pag. 22. *tive* Mother, *and moſt powerful Patroneſs; relying on*
thy Bowels of Mercy, *in all my Wants, Petitions, and*
Tribulations of Body and Mind. Could any thing
greater be ſaid to the Eternal Son of God? And in the
Praiſe:

Verſ. Open my Lips, O Mother of Jeſus.
Reſp. *And my Soul ſhall ſpeak forth thy Praiſe.*
Verſ. Divine Lady, be intent to my Aid.
Reſp. *Graciouſly make haſte to help me.*
Verſ. Glory be to Ieſus and *Mary.*
Reſp. *As it was, is, and ever ſhall be.*

Then follows the eighth *Pſalm*, applied thus to her.

Pag. 24. Mary, *Mother of Jeſus, how wonderful is thy Name,*
even unto the Ends of the Earth!

All Magnificence be given to Mary, *and let her be ex-*
alted above the Stars and Angels.

*

Reign

Reign on high as Queen of Seraphims and Saints; and be thou crowned with Honour, and Glory, &c.
Glory be to Jesus and Mary, *&c.*

In the next Page, follows a Cantique in imitation of the *Te Deum.*

Let us praise thee, O Mother of Jesus! Let us acknowledge thee our Soveraign Lady. Pag. 25.
Let Men and Angels give Honour to thee, the first conceived of all pure Creatures, &c.

I think I need mention no more; only three things I shall observe, (1.) That this is now printed *Permissu Superiorum*; and we thank them for the seasonableness of it, in helping us in *true Representing*, what their allowed Doctrines and Practices are. (2.) That this is published in English, that our People as well as theirs, may be convinced how far we have been from unjust charging them as to such things as these. (3.) That at the same time they plead for keeping the Bible out of the hands of the People, wherein their Discretion is so far to be commended, since the Scripture, and this new Scheme of Devotion, can never stand together. There being not one word in the Bible towards it, but very much against it; and the Psalms and Hymns must be *burlesqu'd* to sound that way.

But what saith our Author to their *Rosaries*, wherein there are *ten Ave Maries to one Pater noster*; which is accounted a special piece of Devotion; and great things are said of the Effects of it by *Alanus de Rupe*, and many others.

1. As to the *Ave Maries*, he saith, *there is no more Dishonour to God in reciting the Angelical Salutation, than in the first pronouncing it by the Angel* Gabriel *and* Elizabeth. Pag. 7.

beth. But it may not be altogether ſo pertinent. But doth he really think they ſaid the whole *Ave Maria*, as it is uſed among them? Did the Angel and *Elizabeth* ſay, *Sancta Maria, Mater Dei? &c. ora pro nobis peccatoribus, nunc & in hora mortis noſtræ?* If not, to what purpoſe are they mentioned here?

2. As *to the Repetition*, that, he ſaith, *is no more an idle Superſtition, than* David's *repeating the ſame words 26 times in the 136 Pſalm.* But what is this to the Queſtion, *why more Supplications to the Bleſſed Virgin, than to Chriſt?* And not one word of Anſwer is given to it. But *Alanus de Rupe* anſwers it roundly, *Becauſe the Bleſſed Virgin is our Mediatrix to Chriſt, the Mother of Mercy, and the ſpecial Patroneſs of Sinners.* This is indeed true repreſenting.

Alanus de Rupe de uſu Pſalterii, l. 1. c. 6.

IV. *Of paying Divine Worſhip to Reliques.*

FOR the right underſtanding this Controverſy, we are to conſider,

1. That there is a due Veneration to the Bodies of Saints and Martyrs, allowed on both ſides; and there is an undue Worſhip of them, which is diſowned on both ſides. The due Veneration is, a Religious Decency to be obſerved towards them; which lies in avoiding any thing like Contempt or Diſhonour to them, and uſing all ſuch Teſtimonies of Reſpect and Decency, which becomes the Remains of Excellent Perſons; provided we are ſatisfied of their Sincerity, without having recourſe to Divine Omnipotency to prove them; which *Ferrandus* the Jeſuit runs ſo much to, to prove the Truth of many Reliques, worſhipped in the Church of *Rome* in many places at once. But that it is poſſible to exceed in the Worſhip of true Reliques, even

even *Bellarmin* confeſſeth, who ſays, that God took away the Body of *Moſes*, leſt the People ſhould give Divine Worſhip to it. And St. *Jerom* as hot as he was againſt *Vigilantius*, yet he utterly denied giving any Adoration to the Reliques of Martyrs. It ſeems then it is very poſſible to exceed that way. *De Imag. Sanct. l. 2. c. 4.*

2. The Queſtion then is, Whether thoſe Acts of Worſhip which are allowed in the Church of *Rome*, do not go beyond due Veneration? For it is unreaſonable to ſuppoſe thoſe who give it, to believe thoſe Reliques to be Gods; and therefore it muſt be ſuch a Worſhip as is given to them, ſuppoſing them to be only Reliques of ſuch Perſons. The Council of *Trent* decrees Honour and Veneration to be given to them, but never determines what is due, and what not: it forbids all Exceſſes in drinking and eating, in the viſiting of Reliques; but not a word of Exceſſes in worſhipping of them, unleſs it be comprehended under the name of Superſtition. But *Superſtition* lies in ſomething forbidden, according to their notion of it: therefore, if there be no Prohibition by the Church, there can be no Superſtition in the Worſhip of them. And if they had thought there had been any in the known Practices of the Church, they would certainly have mentioned them; and becauſe they did not, we ought in Reaſon to look on them as allowed. And yet not only *Caſſander* complains of the great Superſtition about them; but even the *Walenbergii* lately confeſs, that the Abuſes therein, have not only been offenſive to us, but to themſelves too. *Caſſand. Conſult. Art. 21. Tract. ſpecial. 4. Controv. 4.*

But what ſaith our *Repreſenter* to them?

He believes it damnable to think there's any Divinity in the Reliques of Saints, or to adore them with Divine Honour. P. 7. But what is this adoring them with Divine Honour? A true Repreſenter ought to have told

us what he meant by it, when the whole Controverſy depends upon it. Is it only ſaying Maſs to Reliques, or believing them to be Gods? Is there no giving Divine Honour by Proſtration, burning of Incenſe, &c.? Nothing in expecting help from them? Yes, *if it be from any hidden Power of their own.* But here is a very hard Queſtion: If a Man doth not believe it to be an intrinſick Power in the Reliques, may a Man ſafely go to them, *Opis impetrandæ cauſâ*, as the Council of *Trent* ſaith, in hopes of Relief from them? Is it not poſſible for the Devil to appear with *Samuel*'s true Body, and make uſe of the Relique of a Saint to a very bad end? Then, ſay I, no Reliques can ſecure Men againſt the Impoſture of Evil Spirits, who, by God's Permiſſion, may do ſtrange things with the very Reliques of Saints.

But God hath viſibly worked by them, ſaith our Author, *by making them Inſtruments of many Miracles; and it is as eaſie for him to do it now.* P. 8, 9. This is the force of all he ſaith. To which I anſwer, (1.) It is a very bold thing to call in God's Omnipotency, where God himſelf hath never declared he will uſe his Power; for it is under his own Command, and not ours. But there is no Reaſon to deduce the Conſequence of uſing it now, becauſe he hath done it formerly. And that they may not think this is cavilling in us, I deſire them to read *Pere Annat*'s Anſwer to the Janſeniſts pretended Miracle at *Port Royal*, viz. of the Cure wrought by one of our Saviour's Thorns. There he gives another account of ſuch Miracles than would be taken from us. But where he ſaith, *It is as much for the Honour of God's Name to work ſuch Miracles now*; their own Authors will tell him the contrary; and that there is no ſuch Reaſon now, as in former times, when Religion was to be confirmed by them; and when Martyrs ſuffered upon the ſole account of the Truth of it; and therefore their

Rabat. Joy de Janſeniſts, A. D. 1656.

their Reputation had a great Influence upon converting the unbelieving World. (2.) Suppoſe it be granted, yet it proves not any Religious Worſhip to be given to them. For I ſhall ſeriouſly ask an important Queſtion: Whether they do really believe, any greater Miracles have ever been done by Reliques, than were done by the Brazen Serpent? And yet, altho that was ſet up by God's own Appointment, when it began to be worſhipped after an undue manner, it was thought fit by *Hezekiah* to be broken in pieces. What now was the undue Worſhip they gave to it? Did they believe the Serpent, which could neither move nor underſtand, was it ſelf a God? *But they did burn Incenſe to it.* And did that make a God of it? Suppoſe Men burn Incenſe to Reliques; What then, are they made Gods preſently? Suppoſe they do not, but place them upon Altars, carry them in Proceſſion, fall down before them, with intention to ſhew the Honour they do them; are not theſe as much as burning a little Incenſe, which could not ſignifie ſo much Honour as the other do? and it is hard then to make the one unlawful, and not the other.

V. *Of the Euchariſt.*

THere are two material Points under this Head which are to be examined, becauſe he endeavours to ſet them off with all the advantage he can, *viz.* Adoration of the Hoſt, and Tranſubſtantiation.

I. *Of the Adoration of the Hoſt.*

1. The Queſtion is far enough from being, Whether it be lawful to commit Idolatry? as our *Repreſenter* puts

it. For the Misrepresenter saith, *That a Papist believes it lawful to commit Idolatry:* and to clear this, our Author gravely saith, *He believes it unlawful to commit Idolatry. Pag.* 9. As tho any Men ever owned it to be lawful: Which is, as if the Question were, Whether such a Man committed Adultery, and he should think to clear himself by saying, he believed it unlawful to commit Adultery.

2. The Question is not, Whether Christ may be lawfully adored by us in the Celebration of the Eucharist; which we are so far from denying, that our Church requires our receiving it in the posture of Adoration.

3. The true Question is, Whether the Body of Christ, being supposed to be present in the Host by Transubstantiation, be a sufficient ground to give the same Adoration to the Host, which they would do to the Person of Christ?

And that this is the true state of the Question, will appear by these things.

1. The Council of *Trent* first defined Transubstantiation, and from thence inferred *Adoration of the Host*; as is most evident to any one that will read the fourth and fifth Decrees of the 13*th* Session: *Nullus itaq; dubitandi locus*, &c. *i. e.* If Transubstantiation be true, then Adoration follows. It's true, the sixth Canon only speaks of *Christ being there worshipped*; but that ought to be compared with the first, second, and fourth Canons, where the Doctrine of *Transubstantiation* is fully set down, as the Foundation of that *Adoration*.

2. The *Adoration* is not fixed on the *Person of Christ, as separate from the Host*, but as making *one Object* of Worship together with it. And so the Council of *Trent* declares in the sixth Decree; when it saith, *The Sacrament is never the less to be adored, because it was instituted*

inſtituted to be received. This cannot be otherwiſe underſtood, than as relating to the Sacrament: and ſo *that* whatever it be, muſt be granted to be the Object of Adoration. 'By the Sacrament, ſaith Cardinal *Pal-*'*lavicini*, is underſtood the Object made up of the 'Body of Chriſt, and the Accidents. The Worſhip then being confeſſed to be Adoration, which is due to God alone, and that Adoration directed to the Sacrament as its proper Object; the Queſtion now is, Whether ſuch a Suppoſition in the Sacrament, doth juſtify that Adoration?

Pallavicin. Hiſt. Concil. Trident. l. 12. c. 6.

Our Author ſaith, *He accounteth it moſt damnable to worſhip or adore any Breaden God, or to give Divine Honour to any Elements of Bread and Wine*, p. 9.

Then, I ſay, by his own confeſſion, if it be only Bread, he commits Idolatry; for the Adoration he cannot deny. But our *Repreſenter* loves ambiguous Expreſſions, which to the People ſound very well, but have no ſincere meaning: for what is it he underſtands by his *Breaden God?* If it be that he worſhips a God which himſelf ſuppoſes to be nothing but Bread, we do not charge him with it; but if it be what we believe it to be, the Subſtance of Bread, but himſelf believes to be turned into the Body of Chriſt, then he cannot deny his Adoration to be given to it.

All that can excuſe them is, the Suppoſition; and whether that will or not, is now to be conſider'd.

1. If it be not true, themſelves grant it to be Idolatry. The Teſtimonies of Biſhop *Fiſher*, and *Coſterus*, are ſo well known to the purpoſe, that I ſhall not repeat them. And *Catharinus*, a Divine of Note in the Council of *Trent*, confeſſes it is Idolatry to worſhip an unconſecrated Hoſt, altho the Perſon, through a Miſtake, believes it Conſecrated. And he quotes St. *Thomas* and *Paludanus* for his Opinion; and gives this

Roffenſ. c. Occolamp. l. 1. c. 2. Coſter. Euchirid. c. 8. n. 10.

Catherin. in Catit. p. 133, &c. Ed. Paris, 1535

this Reaſon for it; becauſe Chriſt is not worſhipped ſimply in the Sacrament, but as he is under the Species; and therefore if he be not ſo preſent, a Creature hath Divine Worſhip given it. As thoſe were guilty of Idolatry, who worſhipped any Creatures of old, ſuppoſing God to be there, as that he was the Soul of the World. They were not excuſed, ſaith he, that they thought they worſhipped but one God; becauſe they worſhipped him as preſent in ſuch a manner, as *Lugdun.* 1542. he was not. And this Book of his, he ſaith, in the Review of it, was ſeen and approved by the Pope's Order, by their Divines at *Paris*.

2. If *the Bread were taken to be God*, our Author doth not deny it would be Idolatry, for that were to worſhip a breaden God. Yet here would be a Miſtake, and a groſs one; yet the Miſtake would not excuſe the Perſons committing it from moſt damnable Idolatry, as he confeſſes: Why then ſhould the other Miſtake excuſe them, when they ſuppoſe the Subſtance of the Bread not to be there, but the Body of Chriſt to be under the Species? *Yes*, ſay they, *then no Creature is ſuppoſed to be the Object of Worſhip.* But when the Bread is ſuppoſed to be God, it muſt be ſuppoſed not to be a Creature. There is no Anſwer to be given in this Caſe, but that the Bread really is a Creature, whatſoever they imagined; and if this Miſtake did not excuſe, neither can the other.

2. *Of Tranſubſtantiation.*

Three Things our Author goes upon, with reſpect to this.

1. He ſuppoſes Chriſt's words to be clear for it.

2. He

2. He ſhews the poſſibility of it, from God's Omnipotency. P. 9, 10, 11, 12.
3. He argues againſt the Teſtimony or Evidence of Senſe or Reaſon in this Caſe, from ſome parallel Inſtances, as he thinks.

1. *He believes Jeſus Chriſt made his words good, pronounced at his laſt Supper, really giving his Body and Blood to his Apoſtles; the Subſtance of Bread and Wine being, by his powerful words, changed into his own Body and Blood; the Species only, or Accidents of the Bread and Wine, remaining as before. The ſame he believes of the Euchariſt conſecrated now by Prieſts.*

This is a very eaſy way, of taking it for granted that the words are clear for Tranſubſtantiation. And from no better Ground, to fly to God's Omnipotency to make it good, is as if one ſhould ſuppoſe Chriſt really to be turned into a Rock, a Vine, a Door; becauſe the words are every jot as clear, and then call in God's Omnipotency, which is as effectual to make them good. I confeſs, theſe words are ſo far from being clear to me for Tranſubſtantiation, that if I had never heard of it, I ſhould never have thought of it, from theſe or any other words of Scripture, *i. e.* not barely conſidering the ſound of words, but the Eaſtern Idioms of ſpeaking; the Circumſtances of our Saviour's real Body at that time when he ſpake them; the uncouth way of feeding on Chriſt's real Body, without any Objection made againſt it by his Diſciples. The Key our Saviour elſewhere gives for underſtanding the manner of eating his Fleſh; and withal, if theſe words be literally and ſtrictly underſtood, they muſt make the Subſtance of Bread to be Chriſt's Body; for that is unavoidably the literal ſenſe of the words. For can any Men take *This* to be any

thing

thing but this Bread, who attend to the common ſenſe and meaning of Words, and the ſtrict Rules of Interpretation? Yet this ſenſe will by no means be allow'd; for then all that can be infer'd from theſe words is, that when Chriſt ſpake theſe words, *The Bread was his Body.* But either Chriſt meant the *Bread* by *This*, or he did not; if he did, the former Propoſition is unavoidable in the literal Senſe: if he did not, then by virtue of theſe words, the Bread could never be turned into the Body of Chriſt. For that only could be made the Body of Chriſt which was meant, when Chriſt ſaid, *This is my Body.* This ſeems to me to be as plain and convincing as any Demonſtration in *Euclid.* Which hath often made me wonder at thoſe who talk ſo confidently of the plain Letter of Scripture, being for this Doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation. But ſeveral Divines of the Church of *Rome*, underſtood themſelves better, and have confeſſed, That this Doctrine could not be drawn out of the literal ſenſe of theſe words; as it were eaſy to ſhew, if it had not been lately done already. It is enough here to obſerve, that *Vaſquez* confeſſeth it of *Scotus, Durandus, Paludanus, Ockam, Cameracenſis*; and himſelf yields that they do not, and cannot ſignify expreſly the Change of the Bread and Wine into the Body of Chriſt. For how can, *This is my Body*, literally ſignify, this is changed into my Body? If that Propoſition were literally true, *This is my Body*, it overthrows the change; For how can a thing be changed into that which it is already?

Vaſq. in 3 Part. Diſc. 180. Q. 75 Art. 2. C. 5.

2. *He believes Chriſt being equal to his Father in Truth and Omnipotency, can make his Words good.* We do not in the leaſt diſpute Chriſt's Omnipotency, but we may their familiar way of making uſe of it to help them out, when Senſe and Reaſon fail them. And therefore *Cajetan* well ſaid; 'We ought not to diſpute

Cajetan. in 3 Part. Q. 75. Art. 1, 2, 3.

'about

'about God's Absolute Power in the Doctrine of the 'Sacraments, being things of such constant use; and 'that it is a foolish thing to attribute to the Sacrament 'all that God can do.

But we must consider what he saith against *Sense and Reason*. *For the believing this Mystery, he does not at all think it meet for any Christian to appeal from Christ's Words, to his own Senses or Reason, for the examining the Truth of what he hath said, but rather to submit his Senses and Reason to Christ's Words in the obsequiousness of Faith.* What! whether we know this to be the meaning of Christ's Words, or not? And thus we shall be bound to submit to every absurd Interpretation of Scripture, because we must not use our Senses or Reason for examining the Truth of what is said there. Can any thing be plainer said in Scripture, than that God hath Eyes, and Ears, and Hands? Must now every Man yield to this in the obsequiousness of Faith, without examining it by Principles of Common Reason? And we think we are therefore bound to put another Sense upon those Expressions, because they imply a Repugnancy to the Divine Perfections. Why not then where something is implied which is repugnant to the Nature of Christ's Body, as well as to our Senses? But the Question about judging in this Matter by our Senses, is not, as our Author is willing to suppose, *viz.* Whether our Senses are to be believed, against a clear and express Divine Revelation; but whether the Judgment of our Senses and Reason is not to be made use of for finding out the true sense of this Revelation? And we think there is great reason for it.

(1.) Because we have no more certain way of judging the Substance of a Body, than by our Senses. We do not say our Senses go beyond the Accidents; but we say, our Senses, by those Accidents, do assure us of the

 bodily

bodily Substance, or else it were impossible for us to know there is any such thing in the World.

(2.) Because Christ did himself appeal to the judgment of his Disciples Senses concerning the Truth of his own Body after the Resurrection; *Behold my Hands and my Feet, that it is I my self: handle and see, for a Spirit hath not Flesh and Bones as ye see me have.* Now we think we have Reason to allow the same *Criterion* which Christ himself did about the very same Body. Unless he had then told his Disciples, that there was to be *another supernatural manner of Existence* of the same Body, concerning which their Senses were not to be Judges.

S. Luk. 24. 39.

(3.) Some of the most important Articles of the Christian Faith do suppose the Judgment of our Senses to be true. As about the Truth of Christ's Body; whether he had really a Body, or only the outward Accidents and Appearance of a Body: if he had not, he did not really suffer upon the Cross, and so the Sacrifice of Propitiation there offered up to the Father for the Sins of Mankind is lost. There was a great Controversy in St. *John*'s Time, and afterwards, Whether Christ had any real Body? Those who denied it, brought Revelation for it; those who asserted it, proved it by their Senses, as S. *John* himself, *That which we have seen, and heard, and our hands have handled, &c.* He doth not tell Men, they must submit their Sense and Reason to the pretence of Revelation; but they ought to adhere to the Judgment of their Senses concerning the Reality of Christ's Body. Since therefore Christ himself appealed to it, the Apostles made use of it, without any Caution or Limitation, we have great reason to rely still on the Judgment of our Senses concerning the same Object, *viz.* the Body of Christ.

1. S. Joh. 1. 1, 3.

3. But we must now consider his Instances to overthrow

throw the Judgment of our Senſes and Reaſon in this Point.

1. *He believes Chriſt to be God, though to Senſes he ſeemed nothing but Man.* Do we ever pretend to judg of Chriſt's Divinity by our Senſes? How then can this be pertinent, when our only Diſpute is about judging his Body, and the Subſtance of Bread and Wine by them? And yet the Senſes were of great uſe as to the proof of his Divinity by the Miracles which he wrought? which if they had been like the pretended Miracles in Tranſubſtantiation, could have convinced no Man, becauſe they could never ſee them.

2. *He believes the Holy Ghoſt deſcended on our Saviour, though Senſes or Reaſon could diſcover it to be nothing but a Dove.* If there were no reaſon to judg otherwiſe, the Judgment of Senſe were to be followed: but ſince the Scripture declares it was the Holy Ghoſt deſcending as a Dove, we have no reaſon to queſtion that Revelation. For we do not pretend that our Senſes are ſo far Judges of Divine Appearances, as to exclude the poſſibility of God's aſſuming the ſhape and figure of his Creature when he pleaſes, by moulding the ſubſtance of a real Body into ſuch a Repreſentation. Thus we do not deny the poſſibility of an appearance of the Holy Ghoſt under Bread and Wine, if God thought fit, any more than under a Dove; and in this Caſe we do not pretend that our Senſes can exclude the preſence of a Spirit under the Elements; but that is very different from the preſent Caſe, for here the Subſtance is ſuppoſed to be gone, and nothing but Accidents remaining; and no ſpiritual Preſence of Chriſt is denied, but that of his Body, the very ſame Body which ſuffered on the Croſs.

3. *He believes the Man who appeared to* Joſhua, (ch. 5. 13.); *and the three Men to* Abraham, (*Gen.* 18.)

were really and ſubſtantially no Men, notwithſtanding all the Information and Evidence of Senſe to the contrary, from their Colour, Features, Proportion, Talking, Eating, and many others. And what follows from hence, but that Spiritual Inviſible Subſtances may be under the appearance of Bodies, and that our Senſes cannot be Judges of them? Which is not our Queſtion, but, Whether Bodies can be ſo preſent after the manner of Spirits, as to loſe all the natural Properties of Bodies? and whether a Material Subſtance can be loſt, under all the Accidents proper to it, ſo as our Senſes cannot be proper Judges of one by the other?

But our Author ſeems to grant this, in a natural way of the Exiſtence of a Body: but he ſaith, *Chriſt gives to his Body a ſupernatural manner of Exiſtence, by which being left without extenſion of Parts, and rendred independent of Place, it may be one and the ſame in many Places at once, and whole in every part of the Symbols, and not obnoxious to any corporeal contingencies.*

This is to me a Myſtery beyond all comprehenſion by Senſe or Reaſon; and there is certainly a great difference between governing our Underſtandings, and giving them up, as we muſt do if this Doctrine hold good; for it overthrows any fixed Principles of Reaſon in Mankind concerning the Nature and Properties of Bodies.

For, 1. We muſt ſtill ſuppoſe the Body of Chriſt to be the very ſame individual Body which ſuffered upon the Croſs; but if it have no extenſion of Parts, and be reckoned independent upon Place, it ceaſeth to be a Body. It is granted, that after a natural way of Exiſtence, a Body cannot be in more Places than one: but let the way of Exiſtence be what it will, if it be a Body, it muſt be finite; if finite, it muſt be limited and circumſcribed; if it be circumſcribed within one place,

it

it cannot be in more places, for that is to make it circumſcribed, and not circumſcribed; undivided from it ſelf, and divided from it ſelf at the ſame time. Which is a manifeſt Contradiction, which doth not depend only on Quantity or Extenſion, but upon the eſſential Unity of a Body.

2. If it be poſſible for a Body to be in ſeveral Places by a Supernatural Exiſtence; why may not the ſame Body be in ſeveral Places by a Natural Exiſtence? Is it not becauſe Extenſion and Circumſcription are ſo neceſſary to it, that in a natural Way it can be but in one Place. Then it follows that theſe are eſſential Properties of Bodies; ſo that no true Body can be conceived without them.

3. This Supernatural Exiſtence doth not hinder the Body's being individually preſent in on Place: My meaning is this; A Prieſt Conſecrates an Hoſt at *London*, and another at *York*; is the Body of Chriſt at *London*, ſo preſent there by virtue of Conſecration, as to be preſent at *York* too, by this Supernatural Exiſtence: What then doth the Conſecration at *York* produce? If it be not, then its Preſence is limited to the Hoſt, where the Conſecration is made; and if it be ſo limited, then this ſupernatural Exiſtence cannot take off its Relation to Place.

4. The ſame Body would be liable to the greateſt Contradictions imaginable: For the ſame Body after this ſupernatural way of Exiſtence, may not only be above and below, within and without, near and far off from it ſelf: but it may be hot and cold, dead and alive; yea, in Heaven and Hell at once.

5. What is it that makes it ſtill a Body after this ſupernatural way of Exiſtence, *&c.* if it loſe extenſion and dependency on Place? If it be only an aptitude to extenſion, when that ſupernatural Exiſtence is taken off, then it muſt either be without Quantity, or with

it.

it. If it be without quantity, how can it be a Body? If with quantity, how is it poſſible to be without Extenſion?

6. This confounds all the differencs of Greater and Leſs, as well as of Diſtance and Nearneſs. For upon this Suppoſition, a thing really greater may be contained within a leſs; for the whole Original Body of Chriſt, with all its Parts, may be brought within the compaſs of a Wafer; and the whole be in every part without any diſtance between Head and Feet.

7. This makes Chriſt to have but one Body, and yet to have as many Bodies as there are conſecrated Hoſts. No, ſaith our Author, *This ſupernatural manner of Exiſtence is without danger of multiplying his Body, or making as many Chriſts as Altars.* P. 11. But how this can be, is paſt all human Underſtanding: For every Conſecration hath its Effect, which is ſuppoſed to be the Converſion of the Subſtance of the Bread into the Body of Chriſt. Now, when a Prieſt at *London* converts the Bread into the Body of Chriſt there, he doth it not into the Body of Chriſt at *York*, but the Prieſt there doth it; therefore the Body of Chriſt at *London*, is different from that at *York*; or elſe the Converſion at *London* would be into the Body, as at *York*. But if not, what is the ſubſtantial Term of this ſubſtantial Change, where nothing but an accidental Mode doth follow? If there be any ſuch Term, whether that muſt not be a Production of ſomething which was not before; and if it be ſo, Chriſt muſt have as many new Bodies, as there are Conſecrations.

8. This makes that which hath no particular Subſiſtence of its own, to be the Subject of a ſubſtantial Change; for this is the condition of Chriſt's Body, whatever its manner of Exiſtence be, after the Hypoſtatical Union to the Divine Nature. For, when *Bellarmin*,

Larmin, *Petavius*, and others of their greateſt Divines, undertake, againſt *Neſtorius*, to explain the Hypoſtatical Union, they tell us it conſiſts in this, that the Human Nature loſeth its proper Subſiſtence, and is aſſumed into the Subſiſtence of the Divine Nature. From whence I infer, That the Body of Chriſt, having no proper Subſiſtence of its own, there can be no ſubſtantial Change into that which hath no proper Subſiſtence, but into that which hath; and conſequently the Change muſt be into the Divine Nature principally; from whence it will follow, the Elements loſing their Subſiſtence, upon Conſecration the Divinity muſt be united hypoſtatically to them, as to the Human Nature; and ſo there will be as many Hypoſtatical Unions, as there are Conſecrations. And ſo this Doctrine not only confounds Senſe and Reaſon, but the Myſteries of Chriſt's Incarnation too: Which I think is ſufficient for this Head.

Bellarm. de Incarn. l. 3. c. 8. Petav. de Incarnatione, p. 6. c. 1. §. 3.

VI. *Of Merits and Good Works.*

FOR the true ſtating this Controverſy, we are to obſerve;

1. That we do not charge thoſe of the Church of *Rome*, *That they believe Chriſt's Death and Paſſion to be ineffectual and inſignificant, and that they have no dependence on the Merits of his Sufferings, or the Mercy of God for attaining Salvation; but that they are to be ſaved only by their own Merits and Good Works*; as the Miſrepreſenter ſaith, *Pag.* 12.

2. We do not charge them with denying the *neceſſity of Divine Grace in order to Merit*; *or with aſſerting that they can merit independently thereupon.*

3. We do by no means diſpute about the *Neceſſity of Good*

Good Works, in order to the Reward of another Life; or assert that Christ's Merits will save Men without *working out their own Salvation*; but do firmly believe, that *God will judg Men according to their Works.*

The Question then is, *Whether the Good Works of a just Man*, as our Author expresses it, *are truly meritorious of Eternal Life?* Which he affirms, but qualifies with saying, *That they proceed from Grace, and that through God's Goodness and Promise, they are truly meritorious.* But the Council of *Trent denounces an Anathema against those who deny the Good Works of justified Persons, to be truly meritorious of the increase of Grace, and of Eternal Life.*

Pag. 13.

Concil. Trident. Sess. 6. Can. 32.

Here then lies the Point in difference, (1.) Whether such Good Works can be said to be *truly meritorious?* (2.) Whether those who deny it, deserve an *Anathema* for so doing? As to what relates to *God's Acceptance and Allowance, and his Goodness and Promise*, we freely own all that he saith about it; and if no more be meant, what need an *Anathema* about this matter? There must therefore be something beyond this, when Good Works are not only said to be *truly meritorious*, but we are cursed if we do not say the same.

To make any thing *truly meritorious*, we must suppose these Conditions requisite.

1. That what we pretend to merit by, be our own free Act.
2. That it be not defective.
3. That there be an Equality between it, and the Reward due to it.
4. That there be an Obligation in point of Justice, to give that Reward to him that doth it.

And from these Considerations, we deny that Good Works, even of justified Persons, can be *truly meritorious*.

1. It is granted by themselves, That what is *truly meritorious*, must be a free Act of the Person who doth it. Now the Good Works of Justified Persons cannot be said to be their own free Acts, if the Power of doing them depend upon Divine Assistance, and there was an antecedent Obligation upon them to perform them: So that they can do nothing but what they are bound to, as God's Creatures; and their very Power of doing it is from the Grace of God. If Men pretended to merit at anothers hands by what God gives, there were some colour for it; but to merit from God himself by what he gives us, seems very incongruous. If I owe a Man an 100 *l.* and another knowing me unable to pay it, gives me so much to pay the Debt, this is no more than what may be called strict Payment, as to the Creditor; but if the Creditor himself gives me this 100 *l.* to pay himself with, will any Man call this strict Payment? He may call it so himself, if he pleases, but that only shews his Kindness and Favour; but it doth not look very modestly or gratefully, for the Debtor to insist upon it as *true legal Payment*. Just so it is in good Works done by the power of God's Grace, which we could never have done without it; and therefore such cannot be *truly Meritorious*.

Meritum est Actio libera cui Merces debetur ex justitiâ. Coster. *Enchirid. de Meritis bon. Oper. c.* 7.

In quantum homo propriâ voluntate facit id quod debet, meretur apud Deum, alioquin reddere debitum non esset meritorum. Aquin. 1, 2. *qu.* 114. *artic.* 1. *resp. ad* 1.

2. What is *truly meritorious* must not be defective; because the Proportion is to be equal between the Act, and the Reward due to it; which being perfect, requires that there be no Defect in the Acts which merit it. But this can never be said of Good Works of Justified Persons, that they have no Defects in them. We do not say, they are not Good Works, but they are not exact and perfect: for altho the Grace of God, as it

comes from him, be a perfect Gift; yet as it acts upon Mens Minds, it doth not raise them to such a degree, but that they have Imperfections in their best Actions. And whatever is defective, is faulty; whatever is faulty, must be forgiven; whatever needs forgiveness, cannot be *truly meritorious*. But not only their Good Works are defective; but if they would merit, they ought to have none but Good Works, whereas the mixture of others renders the good uncapable of being *meritorious*, because there is so much to be pardoned, as takes away all claim of *Merit* in the good they perform. And themselves do not pretend, that Men can merit the Grace of Remission; but it is very strange that those who cannot deserve to be forgiven, should deserve to have an infinite Reward bestowed upon them.

Meritum se habet ad præmium sicut pretium ad illud quod emitur. Altisiodor. l. 3. tr. 12.

Absoluta æqualitas inter merceden & meritum ponitur per modum Justitiæ commutativæ. Bell. Justif. l. 5. c. 14.

3. There must be an exact Proportion between the Act and the Recompence: for to merit, is to pay a Price for a thing; and in such Acts of commutative Justice, there must be an Equality of one thing with another. But what Equality can there be between the imperfect Good Works of the best Men, and the most perfect Happiness of another World? especially when that consists in the fruition of the Beatifical Vision? For what Proportion can there be between our Acts towards God, and God's Acts towards the Blessed in Heaven? Let the Acts be of what Person soever, or of what Nature soever, or from what Principle soever; as long as they are the Acts of finite imperfect Creatures, it is impossible there should be any Equality, or exact Proportion between them and the Eternal Favour of God, which is the Reward promised.

4. Where Acts are *truly meritorious*, there follows an Obligation of strict Justice, to pay the Recompence due to them. But what strict Justice can there be between the Creator and his Creatures, to recompence the

the Service they are bound to perform; when their very Being, Power to act, Assistance in acting, and Recompence for it, are all from his Bounty and Goodness? But our Author would avoid all this, by saying, that though Good Works are *truly meritorious*; yet it is *through the Merits of Christ, and as they proceed from Grace, and through his Goodness and Promise that they are so*; *i. e.* they are truly meritorious, because it appears from all these things they neither are, nor can be meritorious. For,

(1.) How come the Merits of Christ to make Good Works *truly meritorious*? Are the Merits of Christ imputed to those Good Works? Then those Good Works must be as meritorous as Christ's own Works; which I suppose he will not assert. Or, is it that Christ hath merited the Grace whereby we may merit? But even this will not make our personal Acts truly meritorious; and the nature of Merit relates to the Acts, and not to the Power.

(2.) How comes the Power of Grace to make them *truly meritorious*; when the Power of Grace doth so much increase the Obligation on our side? If it be said, *That the state of Grace puts Men into a Capacity to merit*: we might more reasonably infer the contrary, that it puts them out of a Capacity of meriting; because the Remission of Sins, and the Favour of God, are things for which we can never make him any Recompence.

(3.) How comes a Divine Promise to make Acts truly meritorious? For God's Promise is an Act of meer Kindness, which is very different from strict Justice: and although by the Promise God binds himself to performance; yet how come those Acts to be more meritorious of Heaven, than the Acts of Repentance are of Remission of Sins? Yet none will now say, that there can be any Acts meritorious of that.

Yet certainly there is as clear a Promiſe of Pardon upon Repentance, as there is of Heaven upon Good Works: and if the Promiſe in the other caſe, doth not make Repentance meritorious of Pardon; how can it make Good Works truly meritorious of Eternal Life? But notwithſtanding, we do not deny God's Fidelity to his Promiſe may be called *Juſtice*; and ſo God, as a *Righteous Judg*, may give *a Crown of Righteouſneſs to all that follow St.* Paul's *Example*, without making Good Works to be *truly meritorious.*

2 Tim. 4. 8.

VII. *Of Confeſsion.*

1. WE do not charge the Church of *Rome*, that *in the power of abſolving, they make Gods of Men*; P. 14. as our *Miſrepreſenter* pretends.

2. We do not deny, *That Chriſt gave to the Biſhops and Prieſts of the Catholick Church, Authority to abſolve any truly penitent Sinner from his Sins*, (which he therefore needleſly proves out of Scripture.) *and that ſuch Abſolution is ratified in Heaven.*

3. We are glad to find that our Author declares, *That no Man receives benefit by Abſolution, without Repentance from the bottom of his Heart, and real Intention of forſaking his Sins*; P. 15. by which we hope he means more than Attrition.

But yet there are ſome things which ſtick with us, as to the Doctrine and Practice of the Church of *Rome* in this matter, which he takes no notice of.

1. That ſecret Confeſſion of Sins to a Prieſt is made ſo neceſſary to Salvation, that an *Anathema* is denounced againſt all that deny it, when they cannot deny that God doth forgive Sins upon true Contrition. For the Council of *Trent* doth ſay, *That Contrition, with*

Seſſ. 14. *Can.* 6.

Seſſ. 14. *c.* 4.

Charity,

Charity, doth reconcile a Man to God before the Sacrament of Penance be actually received. But then it adds, *That the desire of Confession is included in Contrition:* Which is impossible to be proved by Scripture, Reason, or Antiquity. For so lately, as in the time of the *Master of the Sentences*, and *Gratian* (in the 12*th* Centurie) it was a very disputable Point, whether Confession to a Priest were necessary. And it is very hard for us to understand how that should become necessary to Salvation since, which was not then. Some of their own Writers confess, that some good Catholicks did not believe the necessity of it. I suppose the old Canonists may pass for good Catholicks; and yet *Maldonat* saith, *That all the Interpreters of the Decrees held, that there was no Divine Precept for Confession to a Priest*; and of the same Opinion he grants *Scotus* to have been. But he thinks *it is now declared to be Heresy, or he wishes it were.* And we think it is too much already, unless there were better ground for it.

Lomb. *l.* 4. *Dist.* 17. Grat. *de Pœnit. Dist.* 1. *c.* 90. *Quidam.*

Greg. de Valentiâ *de Necessit. Confess. c.* 2. *Maldonat. Oper. To.* 2. *de Pœnit. c.* 2, & 3.

2. That an *Anathema* is denounced against those who do not understand the words of Christ, *Whose Sins ye remit, they are remitted, &c.* of the Sacrament of Penance, so as to imply the Necessity of Confession: Whereas there is no appearance in the words of any such Sense; and themselves grant, that in order to the Remission of Sins, by Baptism, (of which St. *Matthew* and St. *Mark* speak in the *Apostles Commission*) there is no necessity of *Sacramental Confession*, but a General Confession is sufficient. And from hence the Elder *Jansenius* concludes, 'That the 'Power of Remission of Sins here granted, doth not 'imply *Sacramental Confession*. *Cajetan* yields, *There is no Command for Confession here.* And *Catharinus* adds, *That* Cajetan *would not allow any one Place of Scripture to prove Auricular Confession.* And as to this parti-

John 20. 23.

S. Mat. 28. 19. Mark 16. 16. *Jansen. Concord Evang. c.* 147

Cajetan. in loc. Ed. Paris, 1540. *Catharin. in Cajetan. l.* 5. p. 444.

particular, he denies that there is any Command for it; and he goes not about to prove it, but that *Cajetan* contradicts himself elsewhere, *viz.* when he wrote School-Divinity, before he set himself to the study of the Scriptures. *Vasquez* saith, 'That if 'these words may be understood of Baptism, none 'can infer from them the Necessity of Auricular 'Confession. But *Gregory de Valentia* evidently proves, that this place doth relate to Remission of Sins in Baptism; not only from the Comparison of Places, but from the Testimonies of S. *Cyprian*, S. *Ambrose*, and others.

Vasquez *in* 3 *Part. Tb. Tom.* 4. *Qu.* 90. *Art.* 1. *Dub.* 2. *Num.* 2. Greg. de Valent. *in Thom. Tom.* 4. *Disp.* 7. *Qu.* 9. *Punct.* 2. *p* 284.

3. That it is expressed in the same *Anathema*'s that this hath been always the Doctrine and Practice of the Catholick Church from the beginning. We do not deny the ancient practice, either of *Canonical Confession*, as part of the Discipline of the Church for publick Offences; nor of *Confession*, for ease and satisfaction of the perplexed Minds of doubting or dejected Penitents; but that which we say was not owned nor practised by the Church from the Beginning, was this Sacramental Confession as necessary to the Remission of Sins before God. It is therefore to no purpose to produce out of *Bellarmine*, and others, a great number of Citations, to prove that which we never deny; but if they hold to the Council of *Trent*, they must prove from the Fathers, that Sins after Baptism cannot be forgiven without Confession to Men: Which those who consider what they do, will never undertake, there being so many Testimonies of undoubted Antiquity against it. And it is observable, that *Bonaventure* grants, that before the *Lateran* Decree of *Innocentius* 3. it was no Heresy to deny the Necessity of Confession; and so he excuses those who in the time of *Lombard* and *Gratian*, held that Opinion.

Bonavent. *in l.* 4. *Sent. Dist.* 17. *part.* 2.

Opinion. And all other Christians in the World besides those of the Church of *Rome*, do to this day reject the Necessity of Particular Confession to a Priest, in order to Remission, as the Writers of the Church of *Rome* themselves confess. So *Godignus* doth of the *Abyssins*; *Philippus à SS. Trinitate*, of the *Jacobites*; *Clemens Galanus* of the *Nestorians*, who saith, 'They made a Decree against the use of Confession to any but to God alone. And *Alexius Menezes* of the Christians, of of S. *Thomas* in the *Indies*. The Greeks believe Confession only to be of Positive and Ecclesiastical Institution, as the late Author of the *Critical History of the Faith and Customs of the Eastern Nations*, proves. And the very Form of their Absolution declares, that they do not think particular Confession of all known Sins, necessary to Pardon: for therein the Priest absolves the Penitent from *the Sins he hath not confessed through forgetfulness, or shame*. And now let any one prove this to have been a Catholick Tradition by *Vincentius* his Rules, *viz. That it hath been always received, every where, and by All.*

Godign. *de rebus Abassin. l.1. c.28.*

Itinerarium Orientale. l.5. c.8.

Galan. Concil. Eccles. Armenæ To. 2. p. 605.

Histoire Critique de la Creance & de Coutums des Nations du Levant. ch.8. p.105.

Ch.1. p.14.

Resp.1. Jer m. Patriarch. ad Theolog. Wittemberg. p.87.

Archid. de Concord. Ecclesiæ Occident. & Orient, in 7 Sacram. l.4.c.3.

Goar *in Eucholog. p.681.*

VIII. *Of Indulgences.*

1. THey must be extreamly ignorant, who take the Power of Indulgences, to be *a Leave from the Pope to commit what Sins they please; and that by vertue thereof, they shall escape Punishment for their Sins, without repentance in another World.* Yet this is the sense of the Misrepresentation which, he saith, is made of it. And if he saith true in his Preface, *That he hath described the Belief of a Papist, exactly according to the apprehension he had when he was a Protestant*: He shews how well he understood the Matters in Difference,

Pag. 15, 16.

ference, when I think no other Person besides himself ever had such an apprehension of it, who pretended to be any thing like a Scholar.

2. *But now he believes it damnable to hold that the Pope, or any other Power in Heaven or Earth, can give him leave to commit any Sins whatsoever; or that for any Sum of Mony, he can obtain any Indulgence or Pardon for Sins that are to be committed by him, or his Heirs hereafter.* Very well! But what thinks he of obtaining an Indulgence, or Pardon, after they are committed? Is no such thing to be obtained in the Court of *Rome* for a Sum of Mony? He cannot but have heard of the *Tax* of the *Apostolick Chamber for certain Sins*, and what Sums are there set upon them. Why did he not as freely speak against this? This is published in the vast *Collection* of *Tracts* of *Canon Law*, set forth by the *Pope's Authority*, where there are certain Rates for Perjury, Murder, Apostacy, *&c.* Now what do these *Sums* of Mony mean? If they be small, it is so much the better Bargain, for the Sins are very great. And *Espencæus* complains, that this Book was so far from being called in, that he saith, the Pope's Legats renewed those Faculties, and confirmed them. It seems then a Sum of Mony may be of some consequence towards the obtaining Pardon for a Sin past, though not for a Licence to commit it. But what mighty difference is there, whether a Man procures with Mony a Dispensation, or a Pardon? For the Sin can hurt him no more, than if he had Licence to commit it.

Tractat. Tractatuum. To. 15. *Part.* 1. *f.* 368.

Espencæ *in Ep. ad Tit. c.* 1. *degress.* 2.

3. *He doth believe there is a Power in the Church to grant Indulgences; which,* he saith, *concern not at all the Remission of Sins, either Mortal or Venial, but only of some Temporal Punishments remaining due after the Guilt is remitted.* Here now arises a Material Question, *viz.*

viz. Whether the *Popes*, or the *Repreſenter*, be rather to be believed. If the Popes, who grant the Indulgences to be believed; then not only the bare Remiſſion of Sins is concerned in them, but *the Plenary*, and *moſt Plenary Remiſſion of Sins* is to be had by them. So *Boniface* the 8*th*, in his Bull of *Jubilee* granted, *Non ſolum plenam & largiorem, imo pleniſſimam veniam peccatorum.* If theſe words had no relation to Remiſſion of Sins, the People were horribly cheated by the ſound of them. In the Bull of *Clement* the 6*th*, not extant in the *Bullarium*, but publiſhed out of the *Utrecht* Manuſcript, not only a Plenary Abſolution from all Sins is declared to all Perſons who died in the way to *Rome*; but he commands the Angels of Paradiſe to carry the Soul immediatly to Heaven. And I ſuppoſe, whatever implies ſuch an Abſolution as carries a Soul to Heaven, doth concern Remiſſion of Sins. *Boniface* the 9*th* granted Indulgences, *à Pœnâ & à Culpâ*; and thoſe certainly concerned Remiſſion of Sins; being not barely from the Temporal Puniſhment, but from the Guilt it ſelf. *Clement* the 8*th*, whom *Bellarmine* magnifies for his care in reforming Indulgences, in his Bull of *Jubilee*, grants a moſt Plenary Remiſſion of Sins; and *Urban* the 8*th*, ſince him, not only a Relaxation of Penances, but Remiſſion of Sins; and ſo lately as *A. D.* 1671. *Clement* the 10*th* publiſhed an Indulgence upon the Canonization of five new Saints, wherein he not only grants a Plenary Indulgence of Sins, but upon invocation of one of theſe Saints in the point of Death, a Plenary Indulgence of all his Sins. And what doth this ſignify in the point of Death, if it do not concern the Remiſſion of Sins?

Bullar. Cherubin. in To. 1. *p.* 204.

Prorſus mandamus Angelis Paradiſi, quantum animam illius à Purgatorio penitus abſolutam in Paradiſi gloriam introducant. Bulla Clem. 6. *ultrajecti A. D.* 1653. *Gobel. Perſon. Coſmodr. æt.* 6. *c.* 86. *p.*278. Bellar. *To.* 3. *p.*74. *To.* 4. *p.*86.

4. *Indulgences*, he ſaith, *are nothing elſe but a Mitigation or Relaxation, upon juſt Cauſes, of Canonical Penances, which are or may be enjoyned by the Paſtors of the*

Church on penitent Sinners, according to their several degrees of Demerits. If by Canonical Penances, they mean those enjoyned by the Penitential Canons, *Greg. de Valentia* saith, *This Opinion differs not from that of the Hereticks, and makes Indulgences to be useless and dangerous things.* *Bellarmine* brings several Arguments against this Doctrine. (1.) 'There would be no need 'of the Treasure of the Church; which he had proved 'to be the Foundation of Indulgences. (2.) They 'would be rather hurtful than profitable, and the *Church* 'would deceive her Children by them. (3.) They could 'not be granted for the Dead. (4.) They who receive 'Indulgences, do undergo Canonical Penances. (5.) The 'form of them doth express, that they do relate to God, 'and not only to the Church. And this, I think, is sufficient to shew how far he is from true Representing the Nature of Indulgences; for we do not dispute the Churche's Power in relaxing Canonical Penances to Penitent Sinners upon just Causes.

Greg. de Valent. *de Indulg.* c. 2.

Bell. *de Indulg.* l. 1. c. 7.

c. 2.

IX. *Of Satisfaction.*

1. HE *believes it damnable to think any thing injurious of Christ's Passion.* But then he distinguishes *the Eternal and Temporal Pain due to Sin. As to the Guilt and Eternal Pain, the Satisfaction,* he saith, *is proper to Christ; but as to the Temporal Pain, which may remain due by God's Justice, after the other are remitted,* he saith, *that Penitent Sinners may in some measure satisfy for that by Prayer, Fasting, Alms, &c.* p. 17.

2. *These Penitential Works,* he saith, *are no otherwise satisfactory, than as joined and applied to Christ's Satisfaction, in virtue of which alone our good Works find a grateful acceptance in God's sight.* p. 19.

But

But for right apprehending the State of the Controverſy, we muſt conſider;

1. That they grant both Eternal and Temporal Pain due to Sin, to be remitted in Baptiſm; ſo that all the Satisfaction to be made, is for Sins committed after Baptiſm.

2. We diſtinguiſh between Satisfaction to the Church before Abſolution, and Satisfaction to the Juſtice of God for ſome part of the puniſhment to Sin which is unremitted.

3. We do not deny that truly Penitential Works are pleaſing to God, ſo as to avert his Diſpleaſure; but we deny that there can be any Compenſation in way of equivalency, between what we ſuffer, and what we deſerve. *Catech. Roman. Part. 2. c. 5. n. 52, 56.*

The Matter in Controverſy therefore on this Head, conſiſts in theſe things.

1. That after the total Remiſſion of Sins in Baptiſm, they ſuppoſe a Temporal Puniſhment to remain, when the Eternal is forgiven; which the Penitent is to ſatisfy God's Juſtice for; and without this being done in this Life, he muſt go into Purgatory for that End. Of which more under that Head.

2. That this Satisfaction may be made to the Juſtice of God, after Abſolution is given by the Prieſt. So that although the Penitent be admitted into God's Favour, by the power of the Keys, according to their own Doctrine; yet the Application of the Merits of Chriſt, together with the Saints in the Sentence of Abſolution (according to their Form) do not ſet him ſo free, but he either wants a new Supply from the Treaſure of the Church, *i. e.* from the ſame Merits of Chriſt and the Saints; or elſe he is to ſatisfie for the Temporal Puniſhment by his own Penances.

3. That these penitential Works are to be joyned with the Merits of Christ, in the way of proper Satisfaction to Divine Justice. And however softly this may be expressed; the meaning is, that Christ hath merited, that we may merit, and by his Satisfaction, we are enabled to satisfie for our selves. And if the Satisfaction by way of Justice be taken away, the other will be a Controversy about Words.

Catech. Rom. de Penit. Sacr. n. 61.

4. That these penitential Works may not only be sufficient for themselves, but they may be so over-doing, that a great share may be taken from them to make up the Treasure of the Church, for the benefit of others who fall short, when they are duly applied to them in the way of Indulgences. And about these Points, we must desire greater Proof than we have yet ever seen.

X. *Of reading the Holy Scripture.*

1. HE *believes it damnable in any one, to think, speak, or do any thing irreverently towards the Scripture, or by any means whatsoever to bring it into disrepute or disgrace;* but not being contented with this, he adds, *That he holds it in the highest Veneration of all Men living.* Now, here we must desire a little better Representation of this matter. For certainly, those who derive its Authority from the Church; who set Traditions in equal esteem with it; who complain so much of its Obscurity, can never be said to hold it in equal Veneration with those who maintain its independent Authority, its Sufficiency, and Perspicuity. And these are known and material Points in Controversy between us and them: therefore let them not say, they hold it in the highest Veneration of all Men living; though those thought themselves through Catholicks, who have compared it to a Nose of

Pag. 19.

Wax

Wax, to a *Leſbian* Rule, to a dead Letter, unſenſed Characters, and to other things, not fit to be repeated. But we are well pleaſed to find them expreſs ſuch Veneration for it. 1. Wherefore then are the People to be kept from reading it?

2. He ſaith, *It is not out of diſreſpect to it.* But why then? (1.) *Becauſe private Interpretation is not proper for the Scripture,* (2 *Pet.* 1. 20.) One would think the Scripture were not kept *only* from the People, by ſuch a Senſe being put upon it: for any one that would but conſider that place, will find it muſt relate to the Prophets themſelves; and doth he think the Prophets were to be debarred from reading the Scriptures? But this is playing with Scripture, and not reaſoning from it. (2.) *Becauſe in the Epiſtles of St.* Paul *are certain things hard to be underſtood, which the unlearned and unſtable deprave, as alſo the reſt of the Scriptures, to their own Perdition.* (2 *Pet.* 3. 16.) Now in my Opinion, ſuch Men deſerve more to be debarred from the medling with the Scripture, who make ſuch perverſe Inferences from it, than ordinary Readers. And if they uſe all other places, as they do this, they cannot be excuſed from depraving it. It is granted, there were then unlearned and unſtable Men, who miſunderſtood, or miſapplied the Writings of St. *Paul*, and other Scriptures. And what then? There are Men of all Ages, who abuſe the beſt things in the World, even the Goſpel it ſelf, and the Grace of God. Doth it hence follow, that the Goſpel muſt not be preached to them, or the Grace of God made known to them, for fear of Mens making ill uſe of it? If this had been the juſt Conſequence, would not St. *Peter* himſelf have thought of this? But he was ſo far from making it, that he adviſeth thoſe Perſons he writes to, to have a mighty re-

gard

gard to the Scriptures, even to the Prophetical Writings, *as to a Light shining in a dark place*, 1 Pet. 1. 19. According to this way of deducing Consequences, S. Peter should have argued just contrary; *The Prophetical Writings are dark and obscure, therefore meddle not with them, but trust your Guides:* Whereas the Apostle, after he had told them what the Apostles saw and heard, he adds, *That they have a more sure Prophetical Word*, as the Rhemists translate it. How could that be *more sure* to them, unless they were allowed to read, consider, and make use of it? (3.) *Because God hath given only some to be Apostles, some Prophets, other some Evangelists, and other some Pastors and Doctors*, Ephes. 4. 11. Doth it hence follow that the People are not to read the Scriptures? In the Universities, Tutors are appointed to interpret *Aristotle* to their Pupils; doth it hence follow that they are not to read *Aristotle* themselves? It is, no doubt, a mighty Advantage to have such Infallible Interpreters as the *Apostles & Prophets*; and all Christians are bound to follow their Sense, where they have delivered it. But suppose the Question be about the Sense of these Interpreters; must their Books not be looked into, because of the danger of Error? This Reason will still hold against those who go about to deliver their Sense; and so on, till by this Method of Reasoning, all sorts of Books and Interpretations be rejected; unless any such can be found out, which is not liable to be abused or misunderstood. And if there be any such to be had, they are much to blame who do not discover it. But as yet we see no Remedy for two things in Mankind, a proneness to Sin and to Mistake. But of all things, we ought not to take away from them one of the best Means to prevent both, *viz.* a diligent, and careful, and humble reading the Holy Scriptures.

But,

But 3. he denies *that all persons are forbid to read the Scriptures, but only such as have no License, and good Testimony from their Curates: And therefore their design is not to preserve Ignorance in the People, but to prevent a blind, ignorant presumption.* P. 21.

These are plausible pretences to such as search no farther; but the Mystery of this Matter lies much deeper. It was no doubt the design of the Church of *Rome* to keep the Bible wholly out of the hands of the People. But upon the Reformation they found it impossible; so many Translations being made into vulgar Languages; and therefore care was taken to have Translations made by some of their own Body; and since the People of better Inclinations to Piety were not to be satisfied without the Bible; therefore they thought it the better way to permit certain Persons whom they could trust, to have a License to read it: And this was the true Reason of the fourth Rule of the *Index Libr. prohibit.* made in pursuance of the Order of the Council of *Trent*, and published by *Pius* IV. by which any one may see it was not an Original Permission out of any good Will to the Thing; but an Aftergame to get the Bible out of the Hands of the People again: And therefore Absolution was to be denied to those who would not deliver them to their Ordinaries when they were called for: And the Regulars themselves were not to be permitted to have Bibles without a License: And as far as I can understand the Addition of *Clement* VIII. to that Fourth Rule, he withdraws by new Power of granting such Licenses; and saith they are contrary to the Command and Usage of that Church, which he saith is to be inviolably observed: Wherein I think he declares himself fully against such Licenses: And how Inferior Guides can grant them against the Command of the Head of the Church, is a thing not very agreeable to the Unity and Subordination they boast of.

Quod quidem inviolatè servandum est. *Clem.* VIII. ad Reg. 4. Indicis Roman.

XI. *Of Apochryphal Books.*

P. 21. 1. WE do not charge the Church of *Rome* with *making what Additions to Scripture they thi good*, as the *Misrepresenter* saith; but we charge the with taking into the Canon of Scripture such books were not received for Canonical by the Christian Churc as those Books himself mentions, viz. *Toby*, *Judith*, *E clesiasticus*, *Wisdom*, and *Maccabees*.

Concil Trident. Sess. 4.8. Apr. de Canon Script.

2. We do not only charge them with this, but wi Anathematizing all those who do not upon this Decla tion believe them to be Canonical; since they cannot but know, that these Books never were in the *Jewish* C non, and were left out by many Christian Writers. A if the Church cannot add to the Scripture, and Author *thinks it damnable to do it*; how can it ma any Books *Canonical*, which were not so received by t Church? For the *Scripture* in this sense is the *Canon*; therefore if it add to the *Canon*, it adds to the Scriptu *i. e.* it makes it necessary to believe some Books to be infallible Authority, which were not believed to be either by the *Jewish* or Christian Church, as appears abundant Testimonies to that purpose produced by Learned Bishop of this Church; which ought to ha been considered by the *Representer*, that he might have talked so crudely about this matter.

Bp. Cosins *Scholastical History of the Canon of Scripture.*

But however, I must consider what he saith,

Greg. Nazianzen. in Carmin, 2 Vol. p. 98.

1. He produces the Testimony of *Greg. Nazian* who is expresly against him, and declares but Twe Two Books in the Canon of the Old Testame but how doth he prove that he thought these Bo Canonical? He quotes his *Oration on the Maccabe* where I can find nothing like it; and instead of it expresly follows, as he declares, the Book of *Josephus*,

Orat. de Maccab. vol. 1. p. 398.

the Authority of Reaſon concerning them. So that if this proves any thing, it proves *Joſephus* his Book Canonical, and not the *Maccabees*.

2. He adds the Teſtimony of St. *Ambroſe*, who in the place he refers to, inlarges on the Story of the *Maccabees*, but ſaith nothing of the Authority of the Book: And even *Coccius* himſelf grants, that of old *Melito Sardenſis*, *Amphilochius*, *Greg. Nazianzen.* the Council of *Laodicea*, S. *Hierom*, *Ruffinus*, and *Gregory* the Great, did not own the Book of *Maccabees* for Canonical. Ambroſ. de Jacob & Vitæ Erat l. 2. c. 10, 11, 12. Cocci. Theſ. Catho. l. 6. Act 18.

3. *Innocentius ad Exuperium* ſpeaks more to his Purpoſe; and if that Decretal Epiſtle be allowed, againſt which Biſhop *Coſins* hath made conſiderable Objections; then it muſt be granted, that theſe Books were then in the *Roman* Canon; but that they were not received by the Univerſal Church, appears evidently by the Canon of the Council of *Laodicea*, *c.* 60. Wherein theſe Books are left out; and this was received in the Code of the Univerſal Church; which was as clear a Proof of the Canon then generally received, as can be expected. It is true, the Council of *Carthage* took them in; and St. *Auguſtine* ſeems to be of the ſame Opinion: But on the other ſide they are left out by *Melito* Biſhop of *Sardis*, who lived near the Apoſtles times; *Origen*, *Athanaſius*, St. *Hilary*, St. *Cyril* of *Jeruſalem*, *Epiphanius*, St. *Baſil*, *Amphilochius*, St. *Chryſoſtom*, and eſpecially St *Jerom*, who hath laboured in this point ſo much, that no fewer than Thirteen Places are produced out of him to this purpoſe, by the forementioned Learned Biſhop of our Church, who clearly proves there was no Tradition for the Canon of the Council of *Trent* in any one Age of the Chriſtian Church. But our Author goes on. *Scholaſtical Hiſtory, n.* 83. Euſeb. l. 5. c. 24. Orig. pref. in Pſal. Athan. in Synopſi. Hilar. pref. in Pſal. St. Cyril. Catech. 4. Epiph. hær. 8. 76. Baſil. Philocal. c. 3. Amphil. Epiſt. Canon. ad Seleuc. Chryſ. hom. 4. in Gen. *Scholaſtical Hiſtory. n.* 71.

4. It is of little concern to him, whether theſe books were ever in the *Hebrew* Copy. I would only ask whether it be of any concern to him, P. 22.

whether they were divinely inſpired or not? H
ſaith it is damnable to add to the Scripture; by th
Scripture we mean Books written by Divine Inſpiration
Can the Church make Books to be ſo written, which wer
not ſo written? If not, then all it hath to do, is to deliver b
Tradition what was ſo, and what not. Whence ſhoul
they have this Tradition, but from the *Jews*? and the
owned no Divine Inſpiration after the time of *Malach*
How then ſhould there be any Books ſo written afte
that time? And he that ſaith in this Matter, as he doth
It is of little concern to him whether they were in th
Hebrew Canon, doth little concern himſelf what he ought
to believe, and what not, in this matter.

P. 23. 5. *Since the Churches Declaration*, he ſaith, *no Catho
licks ever doubted.* What doth he mean by the Church
Declaration, that of *Innocentius*, and the Council of *Car
thage*? Then the ſame Biſhop hath ſhewed him, th
ſince that time, there have been very many, both i
the *Greek* and *Latin* Church of another Opinion. An
but a little before the Council of *Trent*, *Catharinus* ſaith
Cathar. Adv. Cajet. p 48. ed. Paris 1535. that a Friend of his, and a Brother in Chriſt, deride
him as one that wanted Learning for daring to aſſert the
Books were within the Canon of Scripture; and it i
plain, *Card. Cajetan* could never be perſwaded of it: B
if he means ſince the Council of *Trent*, then we are re
turned to our firſt Difficulty, how ſuch a Council c
make any Books Canonical, which were not received fo
ſuch by the Catholick Church before? For then they d
not declare the Canon, but create it.

XII. *Of the Vulgar Edition of the* Bible.

P. 24, 25. 1. WE do not diſpute about the *Vulgar Editio*
whether it may not be prefer'd before mo
dern *Latin* Editions becauſe of its great *Antiquity* in ſom
par

parts of it, and its general Reception ſince the time of *Gregory* I. But our diſpute is, whether it be made ſo *Authentick* ſince the Council of *Trent*, that no Appeals are to be made to the Originals, *i. e.* whether that Council by its Authority could make a Verſion equal to the Originals out of which it was made? Eſpecially ſince at the time of that Decree, the Vulgar Edition was confeſſed to be full of Errors and Corruptions by *Sixtus* V. who ſaith, he took infinite pains to Correct them, and yet left very many behind, as appeared by *Clement* VIII. who corrected his *Bibles* in very many places, and grants ſome faults were left uncorrected ſtill; Now, how was it poſſible for the Council of *Trent* to declare that Edition Authentick, which was afterwards ſo much corrected? And, whether was the correct Edition of *Sixtus* V. *Authentick* or not, being made in purſuance of the Decree of the Council? If not, how comes *Clemens* his Edition to be made Authentick when the other was not, ſince there may be corruptions found in that, as well as the other; and no one can tell, but it may be Reviewed and Corrected ſtill; as ſome of their own Writers confeſs it ſtands in need of it?

In hac Vulgata Editione viſa ſunt nonnulla mutanda, quæ conſulto mutata non ſunt. *Clem.* VIII. in *Bullâ.*

Luc. Brugenſ. in variis Lect.

2. Our Controverſy is not ſo much about the Authority of the Vulgar *Latin* above other *Latin* Verſions to thoſe who underſtand them; but whether none elſe but the *Latin* Verſion muſt be uſed by thoſe who underſtand it not? And here our *Repreſenter* ſaith, *That he is commanded not to read any of theſe Tranſlations* (ſpeaking of *Tindal*'s, *and that in* Q. Elizabeths *time*) *but only that which is recommended to him by the Church.* If this relate *to the Vulgar* Latin, then we are to ſeek, why the common people ſhould have none to Read but what they cannot underſtand; if to *Tranſlations of their own*, then we doubt not to make it appear, that our Tranſlation allowed among us, is more exact and agreeable than any they can put into their hands.

Nat. Alexand. diſſert. de vulg. verſ. Quæſt. 6.

P 26.

XIII. *Of*

XIII. *Of the Scriptures as a Rule of Faith.*

P. 27. THE only thing inſiſted on here is, *That it is not the Words, but the Senſe of Scripture is the Rule; and that this Senſe is not to be taken from mens private Fancies, which are various and uncertain; and therefore where there is no ſecurity from Errors, there is nothing capable of being a Rule.*

To clear this, we muſt conſider,

1. That it is not neceſſary to the making of a Rule, to prevent any poſſibility of miſtake, but that it be ſuch that they cannot miſtake without their own fault. For Certainty in it ſelf, and Sufficiency for the uſe of others, are all the neceſſary Properties of a Rule; but after all, it's poſſible for men not to apply the Rule aright, and then they are to be blamed, and not the Rule.

2. If no men can be certain of the right ſenſe of Scripture, then it is not plain in neceſſary things; which is contrary to the Deſign of it, and to the cleareſt Teſtimonies of Antiquity, and to the common ſenſe of all Chriſtians, who never doubted or diſputed the ſenſe of ſome things revealed therein; as the Unity of the Godhead, the making of the World by him, the Deluge, the Hiſtory of the Patriarchs, the Captivity of the Jews, the coming of the Meſſias, his ſending his Apoſtles, his coming again to Judgment, *&c.* No man who reads ſuch things in Scripture can have any doubt about the ſenſe and meaning of the Words.

3. Where the ſenſe is dubious, we do not allow any Man to put what ſenſe he pleaſe upon them; but we ſay, there are certain means, whereby he may either attain to the true Senſe, or not be damned if he do not. And the firſt thing every man is to regard, is not his ſecurity from being deceived, but from being damned.

For

For Truth is made known in order to Salvation; if therefore I am ſure to attain the chief end, I am not ſo much concerned, as to the poſſibility of Errors, as that I be not deceived by my own fault. We do not therefore leave men *either to follow their own fancy, or to Interpret Scripture by it*; but we ſay, They are bound upon pain of Damnation to ſeek the Truth ſincerely, and to uſe the beſt means in order to it; and if they do this, they either will not err, or their Errors will not be their Crime.

XIV. *Of the Interpretation of Scripture.*

1. THE Queſtion is not, Whether Men are not bound to make uſe of the beſt means for the Right Interpretation of Scripture, by Reading, Meditation, Prayer, Advice, a humble and teachable temper, *&c. i. e.* all the proper means fit for ſuch an end? but whether after all theſe, there be a neceſſity of ſubmitting to ſome Infallible Judge, in order to the attaining the certain ſenſe of Scripture?

2. The Queſtion is not, Whether we ought not to have a mighty regard to the ſenſe of the whole Chriſtian Church in all Ages ſince the Apoſtles, which we profeſs to have; but whether the preſent *Roman* Church, as it ſtands divided from other Communions, hath ſuch a Right and Authority to interpret Scripture, that we are bound to believe that to be the Infallible ſenſe of Scripture which ſhe delivers.

And here I cannot but take notice how ſtrangely this matter is here Miſrepreſented; for the Caſe is put,

1. As if every one who rejects their pretence of Infallibility, had nothing to guide him but his own private Fancy in the Interpretation of Scripture. P. 29.

2. As if we rejected the ſenſe put upon Scripture by the whole Community of Chriſtians in all Ages ſince the Apoſtles

Apoſtles times. Whereas we appeal in the matters in difference between us, to this univerſal ſenſe of the Chriſtian Church, and are verily perſwaded they cannot make it out in any one point wherein we differ from them. And themſelves cannot deny, that in ſeveral we have plainly the conſent of the firſt Ages, as far as appears by the Books remaining, on our ſide; as in the Worſhip of Images, Invocation of Saints, Papal Supremacy, Communion in both kinds, Prayer and Scripture in known Tongues; and I may ſafely add, the Sufficiency of Scripture, Tranſubſtantiation, Auricular Confeſſion, Publick Communions, Solitary Maſſes, to name no more.

But here lies the Artifice; we muſt not pretend to be capable of Judging either of Scripture or Tradition, but we muſt truſt their Judgment what is the ſenſe of Scripture, and what hath been the Practice of the Church in all Ages, although their own Writers confeſs the contrary; which is very hard.

P. 29. But he ſeems to argue for ſuch a ſubmiſſion to the Church; 1. *Becauſe we receive the Book of Scripture from her; therefore from her we are to receive the ſenſe of the Book.* An admirable Argument! We receive the *Old Teſtament* from the *Jews*, therefore from them we are to receive the ſenſe of the *Old Teſtament*; and ſo we are to reject the true *Meſſias*. But this is not all; if by the Church they mean the Church of *Rome* in diſtinction from others, we deny it; if they mean the whole Chriſtian Church, we grant it; but then the force of it is quite loſt. But why is it not poſſible for the Church of *Rome* to keep theſe Writings, and deliver them to others, which make againſt her ſelf? Do not perſons in Law-Suits often produce Deeds which make againſt them? But there is yet a farther Reaſon; it was not poſſible for the Church of *Rome* to make away theſe Writings, being ſo univerſally ſpread.

2. Be-

2. Becauſe the Church puts the difference between true and falſe Books, therefore that muſt be truſted for the true ſenſe of them. Which is juſt as if one ſhould argue, The Clerks of the Rolls are to give an account to the Court of true Records, therefore they are to ſit on the Bench, and to give Judgment in all Cauſes. The Church is only to declare what it finds as to Canonical Books; but hath no Power to make any Book Canonical which was not before received for ſuch. But I confeſs *Stapleton* ſaith, the Church if it pleaſe may make *Hermes* his Paſtor, and *Clemens* his Conſtitutions Canonical: but I do not think our Author will therein follow him. Controv. 5. Qu. 4. art. 2.

XV. *Of Tradition.*

1. THE Queſtion is not about *Human Traditions ſupplying the Defects of Scripture*, as he miſrepreſents it; but whether there be an Unwritten Word, which we are equally bound to receive with the Written Word: Altho theſe things which paſs under that Name, are really but *Humane Traditions*; yet we do not deny that they pretend them to be of Divine Original. P. 30, 31.

2. We do not deny, but *the Apoſtles might deliver ſuch things by Word, as well as by Epiſtle, which their Diſciples were bound to believe and keep:* but we think there is ſome difference to be made between what we certainly know they delivered in Writing, and what it is now impoſſible for us to know; *viz.* what they delivered by Word without Writing. 2 Theſ. 2. 13.

3. We ſee no ground why any one ſhould believe any Doctrine *with a ſtedfaſt and Divine Faith*, which is not bottom'd on the Written Word; for then his Faith muſt be built on the Teſtimony of the Church as Divine and Infallibe, or elſe his Faith cannot be Divine. But it is impoſſible to prove it to be Divine and Infallible, but by the P. 37.

Written Word; and therefore, as it is not reasonable that he should believe the Written Word by such a Divine Testimony of the Church; so if any particular Doctrine may be received on the Authority of the Church without the Written Word, then all Articles of Faith may, and so there would be no need of the Written Word.

P. 32. 4. The Faith of Christians doth no otherwise stand upon the Foundation of the Churches Tradition, than as it delivers down to us the Books of Scripture; but we acknowledg the general Sense of the Christian Church to be a very great help for understanding the true sense of Scripture; and we do not reject any thing so delivered; but what is all this to the Church of *Rome*? But this is still the way of true Representing.

XVI. *Of Councils.*

P. 33. 1. WE are glad to find so good a Resolution as seems to be expressed in these words, viz. *That he is obliged to believe nothing besides that which Christ taught, and his Apostles; and if any thing contrary to this should be defined, and commanded to be believed, even by Ten Thousand Councils, he believes it damnable in any one to receive it, and by such Decrees to make Additions to his Creed.* This seems to be a very good Saying, and it is pity any thing else should overthrow it. But here lies the Misrepresenting; he will believe what Christ and his Apostles taught, from the Definitions of Councils; and so all this goodly Fabrick falls to nothing; for it is but as if one should say, If *Aristotle* should falsly deliver *Plato*'s sense, I will never believe him, but I am resolved to take *Plato*'s sense only from *Aristotle*'s Words. So here, he first declares he will take the Faith of Christ from the Church; and then he saith, if the Church Representative should contradict the Faith of Christ, he would never believe it.

2. We

2. We diſpute not with them, the Right and Neceſſity of *General Councils*, (upon great occaſions) if they be truly ſo, rightfully called, lawfully aſſembled, and fairly managed; which have been, and may be of great uſe to the Chriſtian World, for ſetling the Faith, healing the Breaches of Chriſtendom, and reforming abuſes. And we farther ſay, that the Decrees of ſuch Councils ought to be ſubmitted to, where they proceed upon certain Grounds of Faith, and not upon unwritten Traditions; Which was the fatal ſtumbling at the Threſhold in the Council of *Trent*, and was not to be recovered afterwards; for their ſetting up Traditions equally with the Written Word, made it eaſie for them to define, and as eaſie for all others to reject their Definitions, in caſe there had not been ſo many other Objections againſt the Proceedings of that Council. And ſo all our Diſpute concerning this matter is taken off from the general Notion, and runs into the particular Debate concerning the Qualifications and Proceedings of ſome which were called Free, General Councils; but were neither General, nor Free; and therefore could not deliver the ſenſe of the Catholick Church, which our Author requires them to do. P. 33.

XVII. *Of Infallibility in the Church.*

1. HE doth not pretend this belongs to the Paſtors and Prelates of his Church, who may fall, he ſaith, into Hereſie and Schiſm; but that the whole Church is ſecured by Divine Promiſes from all Error and Danger of Prevarication; which he proves from the Promiſes of the New Teſtament, *Mat.* 16. 18—28. 20. *John* 14. 16, 26. But however the former ſeems to take away Infallibility from the Guides of the Church, yet that this is to be underſtood of them ſeparately, appears by what follows. P. 36.

P. 38. 2. The like Assistance of the Holy Ghost he believes to be in all General Councils, which is the Church Representative; by which they are specially protected from all error in all definitions and declarations in matters of Faith.

Now here are two sorts of Infallibility tacked to one another by vertue of these general Promises, which ought more distinctly to be considered.

1. To preserve Christs Church so as it shall never cease to be a Church, is one thing; to preserve it from all Error is another: The former answers the End of Christs Promises as to the *Duration* of the *Church*; and the latter is not implied in them.

2. The promise of *teaching them all Truth*, Joh. 16. 13. is not made to the whole Church, but to the Apostles: And their case was so peculiar and extraordinary, that there can be no just inference from the assistance promised to them, of what the Church should enjoy in all Ages.

3. If the diffusive Church have no infallible Assistance promised, then no infallible Assistance can from thence be proved for the Church Representative; so that some particular Promises to the Guides of the Church as assembled together, are necessary to prove the Infallibility of Councils.

4. It by no means proves following Councils to be Infallible, because the Apostles said, *Acts* 15. 28. *It seemed*
P. 38. *good to the Holy Ghost, and to us.* Our Author *doth not doubt, but the same may be prefixed to all determinations in point of Faith, resolved on by any General Council lawfully assembled since that time, or to be held to the Worlds end.* But what Reason he had for not doubting in this matter, I cannot see; *the Assistance*, he saith, *being to extend as far as the Promise*: But shall Assistance imply Infallibility? Then there must be good store, as long as the Promises of Divine Grace hold good: But this Assistance of Councils is very different from the Assistance of Grace; for the

the Church may ſubſiſt without Councils, but cannot without Grace: What General Council was there from the meeting, *Acts* 15. to the Council of *Nice*? Were not Chriſts Promiſes fulfilled to his Church all that time, when it encreaſed in all parts againſt the moſt violent Oppoſition?

5. No Parity of Reaſon from the *Jewiſh* Church can be ſufficient Proof for Infallibility in the Chriſtian. But our Author argues thus, *If Gods ſpecial Aſſiſtance was never wanting to the Church of the Jews ſo as to let it fail in the Truth of its Doctrine, or its Authority; Why ſhould not he believe the ſame of the Church of Chriſt, which is built on better Promiſes?* What ſpecial Aſſiſtance was it which *Iſrael* had, when it is ſaid, that *for a long time Iſrael had been without the true God, and without a teaching Prieſt, and without Law?* And as to *Judah*, was there no failing in point of Doctrine in our Saviours time? It is true they had the Law intire, and that was all that was good among them; for their Teachers had corrupted themſelves and the People, and made the Law of no effect among them: If there were Infallibility any where, it muſt be in the High Prieſt and *Sanhedrim*; but is it poſſible for any Chriſtian to think them infallible, when they were ſo groſly miſtaken about the main Article of their Faith as to the Meſſias, and pronounced him worthy of death? Is not this a fine Argument for the Infallibility of the Guides of the Chriſtian Church? *But the Church of Chriſt hath better Promiſes*: No doubt of it, greater Promiſes of Grace and Mercy in this World, and in that to come: but what is all this to Infallibility in Councils? P. 39. 2 Chron. 15. 3.

6. Chriſt's Command of Obedience to thoſe who ſat in *Moſes* Chair, (*Matt.* 23. 2.) doth not prove the Infallibility of thoſe who ſat there. Yet this is alledged to that purpoſe; and that men ought not to doubt of the Reaſonableneſs of the Commands of their Superiors. P. 39.

But

Chryſoſt. in Matt. Hom. 72. *Hieron.* in loc. *Caten. Gr.* in loc. *Hilær.* Canon. 24. *Theophilact.* in loc.

But St. *Chryſoſtom* ſaith, *our Saviour ſpeaks of the things commanded by the Law of* Moſes. *Per Cathedram Doctrinam Legis oſtendit*, ſaith *S. Jerom*; *Not their own Doctrine, but that of* Moſes, ſaith *Iſidore*; and ſo *Hilary* and *Theophylact*. *Maldonate* confeſſeth, our Saviours Words are to be underſtood, not of their own Doctrine, but of that of the Law; and therefore he yields the Obedience here required is to be reſtrained to that; *All things*, ſaith *Cajetan*, *which they teach out of* Moſes's *Chair: Not all their Doctrines, but as far as they were conformable to the Law*, ſaith *Ferus*. Now, can any one hence infer, that no men ought to diſpute any Commands of Superiors, when it is ſuppoſed, that there is a Rule and Standard for them to ſpeak according to; and our Saviour elſewhere doth ſuppoſe theſe very Men to teach things contrary to the Law; as in the Caſe of *Corban*. Would our Saviour contradict himſelf? or require a blind Obedience in things repugnant to the Law? We do not deny a due ſubmiſſion to our Superiours in the Church; yea, we allow them a Power to determine things not forbidden; and think obedience due in ſuch things by vertue of their Authority; but yet this is far enough from Infallibility, or an unlimited implicit Obedience, which would overthrow the force of all our Saviours Reaſonings againſt the *Scribes and Phariſees*, as to their miſinterpreting the Law, and the Superſtitious Practiſes they impoſed upon the People.

Matt. 15.

XVIII. *Of the* POPE.

1. WE do not charge them with *believing the Pope to be God*; which it ſeems himſelf did, if we believe the *Miſrepreſenter* in his Preface; but there is ſome Reaſon to doubt whether they do not at ſome times give him greater Honour than becomes a Man. I inſtance

ſtance in the Adoration after his Election, when the new Pope is placed upon the Altar to receive the Submiſſions of the Cardinals; but the Altar, themſelves do confeſs to be Sacred to God alone; And there they profeſs to Worſhip Jeſus Chriſt, as preſent in the Hoſt. This therefore looks too much like aſſuming the Place of Chriſt, and not becoming the Diſtance between God and Man. *Cerem.* Sect. 1. c. 2.

2. The Queſtion is, Whether Chriſt hath appointed the Pope or Biſhop of *Rome* to be Paſtor, Governour, and Head of his Church under him? This, he ſaith, he believes, and this he knows we deny, and therefore had Reaſon to expect ſome Proof of it. But inſtead, he tells us how they look on themſelves as obliged to ſhew him the Reſpect due to his Place, which he knows is not the matter in Queſtion. Two things however he ſaith, which ſeem to juſtify his Title. P. 40.

1. He is the Succeſſor of St. *Peter*, to whom Chriſt committed the care of his Flock. But how far is this from proving the Pope to be Head of the Church under Chriſt? For, how doth it appear that Chriſt ever made S. *Peter* Head of the Church, or committed his Flock to him, in contradiſtinction to the reſt of the Apoſtles? This is ſo far from being evident from Scripture, that the Learned men of their Church are aſhamed of the Places commonly produced for it; it being impoſſible ever to juſtify the ſenſe of them according to their own Rules of Interpreting Scripture, *viz.* by the unanimous conſent of the Fathers. For, 1. *Thou art Peter, and upon this Rock will I build my Church*, is interpreted by many of the Fathers both *Greek* and *Latin*, of S. *Peters* Confeſſion, and not of his Perſon; ſo by S. *Chryſoſtom*, S. *Ambroſe*, S. *Auguſtin*, S. *Baſil* of *Seluciæ*, S. *Hilary*, S. *Gregory Nyſſen*, and *Theodoret*; all great and conſiderable Perſons in the P. 41. Matt. 16. 18. *Chryſoſt.* hom. 1. in Pentec. Tom. 5. ed Savil. p 979. *Ambroſ* de Incarnat. Dom. Sacramento c. 5. *Aug.* de verbis Dom. ad Evang. ſecund. Matth. *Serm.* 13. Tract. in Joh. 124. *Baſil. Seleuc.* Orat. 25. ad fin. *Hilar.* de Trinit. *l.* 6. *Greg. Nyſſen* de Advent. Domini cap. ult. *Theodoret* Epiſt. 77. 146.

Chri-

Christian Church, whose words are plain and full to that purpose; and so they can never produce the unanimous consent of the Fathers for S. *Peter*'s Supremacy out of these Words. 2. *And unto thee will I give the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven*, are interpreted by the Fathers of S. *Peter* in common with the other Apostles; so *Origen*, S. *Cyprian*, S. *Hilary*, S. *Hierom*, and S. *Augustin*, as they are all owned by a Member of the *Roman* Communion. And 3. For these Words, *Feed my Sheep*, a late Learned Doctor of the *Sorban* shews, that if they prove any thing Peculiar to S. *Peter*, they must prove him sole Pastor of the Church, which was the thing S. *Gregory* disputed against so warmly. But that there was nothing peculiar to S. *Peter*, above or beyond the rest of the Apostles, he shews at large from S. *Chrysostom*, S. *Cyril*, S. *Augustin* and others, to whom I refer the Reader, and to the former Authors. But suppose it were made to appear, that S. *Peter* was Head of the Church, How doth the Bishop of *Rome*'s Succession in that Headship shew it self? To that he saith, 2. That there hath been a visibile Succession of above Two hundred and fifty Bishops, acknowledged as such in all past Ages by the Christian World. *As such*: What is that? As Bishops of *Rome*? That is not of weight enough to put it upon Trial; as *Heads* of the *Catholick-Church*? That he knows is not only denied by us, but by all the *Greek*, *Armenian*, *Nestorian*, *Abyssin* Churches; so that we dare say, it was never allowed in any one Age of the Christian Church. But we need not insist on the proof of this, since the late mentioned Authors of the *Roman* Communion have taken so great pains, not only to prove the Popes Supremacy to be an Incroachment and Usurpation in the Church, but that the laying it aside is necessary to the Peace and Unity of it. And until the Divine Institution of the Papal Supremacy be proved, it is to no purpose to debate what manner

Matt. 16. 19.

Orig. Comment. in Matt. Gr. Lat. p. 275. *Cyprian.* de Unit. Eccles. *Hilar.* de Trinit. l. 6. *Hier.* c. Jovin. l. 1. c. 14. in Matt. 16. *Aug.* in Joh. Tr. 118. 124. in Epist. Joh. To. 10. Moyens sur & honestes, &c. p. 34, &c. Entretiens de Philaleth. in Philal. p. 121. Joh. Launoi. Epist. part. 5. Reim. Formentino, & Part. 2. Ep. 5. p. 47, &c.

ner of Assistance is promised to the Pope in his Decrees. P. 42. Our Author is willing to decline the debate about his Personal Infallibility, as a matter of Opinion, and not of Faith; and yet he saith he doubts not but God doth grant a special Assistance to the High Priest, for the good of the whole Flock, under the New Law, as he did under the Old; and produces the Instance of *Caiaphas*, Joh. 11. 51. This is a very surprizing way of Reasoning; for if his Arguments be good from Scripture, he must hold the Popes personal Infallibity as a matter of Faith; and yet one would hardly think he should build an Article of Faith on the instance of *Caiaphas*: For what consequence can be drawn from Gods over-ruling the mind of a very bad man, when he was carrying on a most wicked design, to utter such words, which in the event proved true in another sense than he meant them; that therefore God will give a special Assistance to the Pope in determining matters of Faith? Was not *Caiaphas* himself the man who proposed the taking away the Life of Christ at that time? Was he assisted in that Council? Did not he determine afterwards Christ to he guilty of Blasphemy, and therefore worthy of Death? And is not this a rare Infallibility which is supposed to be consistent with a Decree to crucifie Christ? And doth he in earnest think such Orders are to be obeyed, whether the supreme Pastor be Infallible or not? For so he concludes, *That his Sentence is to be obeyed, whether he be infallible or no?*

XIX. *Of Dispensations.*

HERE the *Misrepresenter* saith, That a Papist believes that the Pope hath Authority to dispense with the Laws of God, and absolve any one from the Obligation of keeping the Commandments. On the other side, the *Representer* affirms, That the Pope has no P. 43.

Authority to dispense with the Law of God, and that there's no Power upon Earth can absolve any one from the Obligation of keeping the Commandments: This matter is not to be determined by the ones affirming, and the others denying; but by finding out, if possible, the true sense of the Church of *Rome* about this matter. And there are Three Opinions about it.

1. Of those who assert, That the Pope hath a Power of Dispensing in any Divine Law, except the Articles of Faith: The Gloss upon the Canon Law saith, That where the Text seems to imply, that the Pope cannot dispense against the Apostle, it is to be understood of Articles of Faith: And *Panormitan* saith, This Exposition pleases him well; for the Pope may dispense in all other things: *Contra Apostolum dispensat*, saith the Gloss on the Decree: And the *Roman* Editors in the Margin, refer to 34 *Dist. c. Lector* to prove it: And there indeed the Gloss is very plain in the Case, *sic ergo Papa dispensat contra Apostolum*: And the *Roman* Correctors there justifie it, and say it is no absurd Doctrine as to positive Institutions: But the former notable Gloss, as *Panormitan* calls it, sets down the particulars wherein the Pope may dispense. As 1. Against the Apostles and their Canons. 2. Against the Old Testament. 3. In Vows. 4. In Oaths. The *Summa Angelica* saith, the Pope may dispense as to all the Precepts of the Old Testament. And *Clavasius* founds this Power upon the Plenitude of the Popes Power, according to that Expression in the Decretal mentioned, that he can, *ex plenitudine Potestatis de Jure supra Jus dispensare*; and without such a Power, he saith, God would not have taken that care of his Church, which was to be expected from his Wisdom. *Jacobatius* brings several Instances of this Power in the Pope, and refers to the Speculator for more. *Jac. Almain* saith, That all the Canonists are of Opinion, that the Pope may dispense against the Apostle, and many of their Divines, but not all: For, 2. Some

De Concess. Præbend. è proposuit. Abb. c. proposuit de Conc. Præbend. c. 15. Q. 6 c. Auctoritate

Sum. Angelic. v. dispensatio.

Jacobat. de Conciliis l. 5. p. 215.

Almain. de Potest. Ecclesiæ c. 13.

2. Some of their Divines held that the Pope could not dispense with the Law of God, as that implies a proper Relaxation of the Law, but could only Authoritatively declare that the Law did not oblige in such a particular Case; because an Inferior could not take away the force of a Superiors Law; and otherwise there would be no fixed and immutable Rule in the Church; and if the Pope might dispense in one Law of God, he might dispense in the rest: And of this Opinion were some of the most eminent School-Divines, as *Thomas Aquinas*, *Bonaventure*, *Major*, *Soto*, and *Catharinus*, who at large debates this Question, and denies that the Pope hath any Power to dispense with Gods Law: But then he adds, that the Pope hath a kind of Prophetical Power to declare in what Cases the Law doth oblige, and in what not; which he parallels with the Power of declaring the Canon of Scripture; and this he doth not by his own Authority, but by Gods; He confesseth the Pope cannot dispense with those Precepts which are of themselves indispensable; nor alter the Sacraments; but then, saith he, there are some Divine Laws, which have a general force, but in particular Cases may be dispensed with; and in these cases the Law is to be relaxed, so that the Relaxation seems to come from God himself: But he confesses this Power is not to be often made use of; so that he makes this Power to be no Act of Jurisdiction, but of Prophetical Interpretation, as he calls it; and he brings the Instance of *Caiaphas* to this purpose: And he adds, that the difference between the Divines and *Canonists* was but in Terms; for the *Canonists* were in the right as to the Power, and the Divines in the manner of explaining it.

Catharin. c. Cajetan. c. 6. p. 524.

3. Others have thought this too loose a way of explaining the Popes Power, and therefore they say, That the Pope hath not a bare declaratory Power, but a real

Power of dispensing in a proper sense in particular Cases: For say they, the other is no act of Jurisdiction, but of Discretion, and may belong to other men as well as to the Pope; but this they look on as more agreeable to the Popes Authority and Commission; and a bare declaratory Power would not be sufficient for the Churches Necessity; as *Sanchez* shews at large, and quotes many Authors for this Opinion, and *Sayr.* more; and he saith the Practice of the Church cannot be justified without it: Which *Suarez* much insists upon; and without it, he saith, the Church hath fallen into intolerable Errors; and it is evident he saith, the Church hath granted real Dispensations, and not meer Declarations. And he founds it upon Christs Promise to *Peter*, *To thee will I give the Keys*, and the Charge to him, *Feed my sheep*. But then he explains this Opinion, by saying that it is no formal Dispensation with the Law of God, but the matter of the Law is changed or taken away.

Sanchez. de Matrim l. 8. Disp. 6. n. 5. Sayr. Clavis Reg. l. 6. c. 11. *Suarez*. de vot. l. 6. c. 9. n. 7. 8, 9, 17.

Thus I have briefly laid together the different Opinions in the Church of *Rome* about this Power of dispensing with the Law of God; from which it appears, that they do all consent in the thing, but differ only in the manner of explaining it.

And I am therefore afraid our *Representer* is a very unstudied Divine, and doth not well understand their own Doctrine, or he would never have talked so boldly and unskilfully in this matter.

As to what he pretends, that *their Church teaches that every Lye is a Sin*, &c. it doth not reach the Case; For the Question is not, whether their Church teach men to lye, but whether there be not such a Power in the Church, as by altering the Nature of things, may not make that not to be a Lye, which otherwise would be one: As their Church teaches that Men ought not to break their Vows; yet no one among them questions, but the Pope may dis-

solve

ſolve the Obligation of a Vow, altho it be made to God himſelf. Let him ſhew then, how the Pope comes to have a Power to releaſe a Vow made to God, and not to have a Power to releaſe the Obligation to veracity among men.

Again, We do not charge them with delivering any ſuch Doctrine, *That men may have Diſpenſations to lye and forſwear themſelves at pleaſure*; for we know this Diſpenſing Power is to be kept up as a great Myſtery, and not to be made uſe of, but upon weighty and urgent Cauſes, of great Conſequence and Benefit to the Church, as their Doctors declare. But as to all matters of fact, which he alludes to, I have nothing to ſay to them; for our debate is only, whether there be ſuch a Power of Diſpenſation allowed in the Church of *Rome*, or not? P. 45.

XX. *Of the Depoſing Power.*

TO bring this matter into as narrow a compaſs as may be, I ſhall firſt take notice of his Conceſſions, which will ſave us a labour of Proofs.

1. He yields that the Depoſing and King-killing Power hath been maintained by ſome Canoniſts and Divines of his Church, and that it is in their opinion lawful, and annexed to the Papal Chair. P. 46.

2. That ſome Popes have endeavoured to act according to this Power.

But then he denies that this Doctrine appertains to the Faith of his Church, and is to be believed by all of that Communion. And more than that, he ſaith, *The affirming of it is a malicious Calumny, a down-right Falſity.*

Let us now calmly debate the matter, Whether according to the received principles of the Church of *Rome*, this be only a particular opinion of ſome Popes and Divines, or be to be received as a matter of Faith. The Queſtion is not, Whe-

Whether thoſe who deny it, do account it an Article of Faith; for we know they do not: But whether upon the Principles of the Church of *Rome* they are not bound to do it.

I ſhall only, to avoid cavilling, proceed upon the Principles owned by our Author himſelf, *viz.*

P. 29. 1. That the ſenſe of Scripture, as underſtood by the Community of Chriſtians in all Ages ſince the Apoſtles, is to be taken from the preſent Church.

P. 34. 2. That by the preſent Church he underſtands the Paſtors and Prelates aſſembled in Councils, who are appointed by Chriſt and his Apoſtles for the deciſion of Controverſies; and that they have Infallible aſſiſtance.

P. 40, 41. 3. That the Pope as the Head of the Church, hath a particular Aſſiſtance promiſed him, with a ſpecial regard to his Office and Function.

If therefore it appear that Popes and Councils have declared this Depoſing Doctrine, and they have received other things as Articles of Faith upon the ſame Declarations, Why ſhould they then ſtick at yielding this to be an Article of Faith, as well as the other?

It is not denied, that I can find, that Popes and Councils for ſeveral Ages have aſſerted and exerciſed the Depoſing Power; but it is alledged againſt theſe Decrees, and Acts, 1. That they were not grounded upon Univerſal Tradition. 2. That they had not Univerſal Reception.

Now, if theſe be ſufficient to overthrow the Definitions of Councils, let us conſider the conſequences of it.

1. Then every Man is left to examin the Decrees of Councils, whether they are to be embraced or not; for he is to judge whether they are founded on Univerſal Tradition; and ſo he is not to take the ſenſe of the preſent Church for his Guide, but the Univerſal Church from Chriſts time: which overthrows a Fundamental Principle of the *Roman* Church.

2. Then

2. Then he must reject the pretended Infallibility in the Guides of the Church, if they could so notoriously err in a matter of so great consequence to the Peace of Christendom, as this was; and consequently their Authority could not be sufficient to declare any Articles of Faith. And so all Persons must be left at Liberty to believe as they see cause, notwithstanding the Definitions made by Popes and Councils.

3. Then he must believe the Guides of the *Roman* Church to have been mistaken, not once or twice, but to have persisted in it for Five hundred years, which must take away, not only Infallibility, but any kind of Reverence to the Authority of it. For whatever may be said as to those who have depended on Princes, or favour their Parties against the Guides of the Church, it cannot be denied that for so long time the leading Party in that Church did assert and maintain the Deposing Power. And therefore *Lessius* truely understood this matter, when he said, That there was scarce any Article of the Christian Faith, the denial whereof was more dangerous to the Church, or did precipitate Men more into Heresy and Hatred of the Church, than this of the Deposing Power; for, he says, they could not maintain their Churches Authority without it. Discussio Decreti Magni Concil. Lateran. p. 89.

And he reckons up these ill Consequences of denying it. P. 90, *&c.*

1. That the *Roman* Church hath erred for at least Five hundred years, in a matter fundamental as to Government, and of great Moment: Which is worse than an Error about Sacraments, as Penance, Extreme Unction, *&c.* and yet those who deny the Church can err in one, hold that it hath erred in a greater matter.

2. That it hath not only erred, but voluntarily and out of Ambition, perverting out of Design the Doctrine of the Primitive Church and Fathers concerning the Power of the Church, and bringing in another contrary

to

to it, againſt the Right and Authority of Princes; which were a grievous ſin.

3. That it made knowingly, unrighteous Decrees, to draw perſons from their Allegiance to Princes; and ſo they became the Cauſes of many Seditions and Rebellions, and all the ill Conſequences of them, under a ſhew of Piety and Religion.

4. That the Churches Decrees, Commands, Judgements and Cenſures may be ſafely contemned as Null, and containing intollerable Errors. And that it may require ſuch things which good Subjects are bound to diſobey.

5. That *Gregory* VII. in the Canon *Nos Sanctorum, &c. Urban* II. *Gregory* IX. the Councils of *Lateran* under *Alex.* III. and *Innocent* III. the Councils of *Lyons*, of *Vienna*, of *Conſtance*, of *Lateran* under *Leo* X. and of *Trent*, have all grievouſly and enormouſly erred about this matter; For that it was the Doctrine of them all, he ſhews at large; and ſo Seven General Councils loſe their Infallibility at one blow.

6. That the Gates of Hell have prevailed againſt the Church: For the true Church could never teach ſuch pernicious Doctrine as this muſt be, if it be not true. And if it erred in this, it might as well err in any other Doctrine, and ſo Men are not bound to believe or obey it.

7. That Princes and all Laymen have juſt Cauſe to withdraw from their Church; becauſe it ſhewed it ſelf to be governed by a ſpirit of Ambition, and not by the Spirit of God; and not only ſo, but they may juſtly proſecute all that maintain a Doctrine ſo pernicious to Government, if it be not true.

Let us now ſee what our Author ſaith to clear this from being a Doctrine of the Church of *Rome*.

1. *That for the few Authors that are abettors of this Doctrine, there are of his Communion Three times the number that publickly diſown all ſuch Authority.* If

If this be true, it is not much for the Reputation of their Church, That there ſhould be ſuch a number of thoſe who are liable to all theſe dreadful Conſequences, which *Leſſius* urges upon the deniers of it: But is it poſſible to believe there ſhould be ſo few followers of ſo many Popes, and Seven General Councils, owned for ſuch by the diſowners of this Doctrine, except the *Lateran* under *Leo* 10.? The poor *Eaſtern* Chriſtians are condemned for *Hereticks* by the Church of *Rome*, for refuſing to ſubmit to the Decrees of One General Council, either that of *Epheſus*, or of *Chalcedon*: And they plead for themſelves, That there was a miſinterpretation of their meaning, or not right underſtanding one another about the difference of *Nature* and *Perſon*, which occaſioned thoſe Decrees. I would fain know, whether thoſe Churches which do not embrace the Decrees of thoſe Councils, are in a ſtate of Hereſie or not? If they be, then what muſt we think of ſuch who reject the Decrees of Seven General Councils, one after another, and give far leſs probable accounts of the Proceedings of thoſe Councils in their Definitions, than the other do?

Diſcuſſ. Diſcuſſ. Part 3. Sect. 3. p. 1.

Philip. a SS. Trinit. Itiner. Orient. l. 5 c. 5. Clem. Galan. Concil. Eccl. Arm. Qu. 2. §§. 3. p. 92.

2. He ſaith, *Thoſe who have condemned it, have not been in the leaſt ſuſpected of their Religion, or of denying any Article of Faith.* Let any one judg of this by *Leſſius* his Conſequences: And the Author of the firſt Treatiſe againſt the Oath of Allegiance ſaith in plain Terms, That the Opinion that the Pope hath no ſuch Power, is erroneous in Faith, as well as temerarious and impious; And he proves it by this ſubſtantial Argument; Becauſe they who hold it, muſt ſuppoſe that the Church hath been for ſome time in a damnable Error of Belief, and Sin of Practice: And he not only proves that it was defined by Popes and Councils, but for a long time univerſally received; and that no one Author can be produced before *Calvins* time, that denied this Power

Jeſuits Loyalty, firſt Treatiſe, p. 1, &c.

absolutely, or in any case whatsoever. *But a few Authors that are Abettors of it*, saith our *Representer*: *Not one total Dissenter for a long time*, saith the other: And which of these is the true Representer? *The deniers of it not in the least suspected of their Religion*; saith one: *Their Opinion is erroneous in Faith, temerarious and impious*, saith the other.

A Professor of Lovain, now living, hath undertaken to shew, that the number is far greater of those who assert this Doctrine, than of those who deny it. Auctoritas sedis. P. 47, 48. *Apostolicæ vindicata adversus Natal. Alexand. per Francisc. D. Erast. Colon. A.D.* 1684.

3. If we charge their Church with this Opinion, may not they as well charge ours with the like; since Propositions as dangerous were condemned at *Oxford*, *July* 26. 1683. as held not by *Jesuits*, but by some among our selves? This is the force of his Reasoning: But we must desire the Reader to consider the great disparity of the Case. We cannot deny, that there have been men of ill Minds, and disloyal Principles, Factious and Disobedient, Enemies to the Government, both in Church and State; but have these Men ever had that Countenance from the Doctrines of the Guides of our Church, which the Deposing Doctrine hath had in the Church of *Rome*? To make the Case parallel, he must suppose our Houses of Convocation to have several times declared these damnable Doctrines, and given Encouragement to Rebels to proceed against their Kings, and the University of *Oxford* to have condemned them; for this is truly the Case in the Church of *Rome*; the Popes and Councils have owned, and approved, and acted by the Deposing Principle; but the Universities of *France*, of late years, have condemned it. How comes the Principles of the Regicides among us to be parallel'd with this Doctrine, when the Principles of our Church are so directly contrary to them; and our Houses of Convocation would as readily condemn any such damnable Doctrines, as the University of *Oxford*? And all the World knows how repugnant such Principles are to those of the Church of *England*; and none can be Rebels to their Prince, but they must be false to our Church.

As

As to the Perſonal Loyalty of many Perſons in that Church, as I have no Reaſon to queſtion it, ſo it is not proper for me to debate it, if I did; ſince our buſineſs is not concerning Perſons, but Doctrines; and it was of old obſerved concerning the *Epicureans*, That tho their Principles did overthrow any true Friendſhip, yet many of them made excellent Friends.

XXI. *Of Communion in One Kind.*

FOR our better proceeding in this Controverſie, I ſhall ſet down the State of it as clearly as I can.

1. The Queſtion is not, Whether the firſt Inſtitution of the Sacrament of the Euchariſt by Jeſus Chriſt, were in one Kind, or two; for all confeſs it was under both Kinds.

2. It is not, Whether both Kinds are not ſtill neceſſary for the due Celebration of it; for it is granted that both Kinds are neceſſary to be upon the Altar, or elſe there could be no compleat Sacrifice.

3. It is not, Whether the People may be wholly excluded from both Kinds, and ſo the Sacrifice only remain; for they grant that the People are bound to communicate in one Kind.

4. It is not concerning any peculiar and extraordinary Caſes, where no Wine is to be had, or there be a particular Averſion to it, or any ſuch thing, where poſitive Inſtitutions may be reaſonably preſumed to have no force; But concerning the publick and ſolemn Celebration, and participation of it in the Chriſtian Church.

5. It is not concerning the meer diſuſe or neglect of it, But concerning the lawfulneſs of Excluding the People from both Kinds, by the Churches Prohibition, notwithſtanding the Inſtitution of it by Chriſt in both Kinds, with a Command to keep up the Celebration of it to his Second Coming.

Here now consists the point in Controversie, Whether the Church being obliged to keep up the Institution in both Kinds, be not equally obliged to distribute both as our Saviour did, to as many as partake of it? Our Author not denying the Institution, or the continuance of it, saith, Our Saviour left it indifferent to receive it in one Kind, or both. And that is the point to be examined.

1. He saith, *Christ delivered it to his Apostles, who only were then present, and whom he made Priests just before; yet he gave no command that it should be so received by all the Faithful.*

But were not the Apostles all the Faithful then present? I pray in what capacity did they then receive it? As Priests? How did they receive the Bread before the *hoc facite*? As Priests or as faithful? It is ridiculous to suppose the *hoc facite* changed their capaciy; and if it did, it only relates to consecrating, and not to receiving: but if Christ gave it only to the Apostles as Priests, then for all that I can see, the People are not at all concerned in one kind or other; but it was intended only for Priests: If the People be concerned, how came they to be so? Where is there any command but what refers to the first Institution? And it had been more plausible, according to this Answer, to exclude the People wholly, than to admit them to one Kind, and to debar them the other.

2. *Christ attributes the obtaining Life Everlasting, the end of the Institution, sometimes to receiving under both Kinds, sometimes under one,* John 6. 51, 57, 58. He could not easily have thought of any thing more against himself; for our Saviour there makes it as necessary to drink his Blood, as to eat his Flesh, *Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his Blood, ye have no Life in you*: If this be understood of the Sacrament, as he saith, how is it possible for him to make the Cup indifferent? Unless it be indifferent whether the People be saved or not.

S. John 6. 51.

3. *Chri*

3. *Christ himself administred the Sacrament to some of his Disciples under one kind only*, Luke 24. 30. But is he sure Christ did then administer the Sacrament to them? Or that if he did, the Cup was not implied, since breaking of Bread, when taken for an ordinary Meal in Scripture, doth not exclude drinking at it? But S. *Augustin*, he saith, (l. 49. *de Consensu Evangel.*) understands that place of the Sacrament. If he doth, it cannot be where he saith; for S. *Augustin* wrote but Four Books of that Subject; but l. 3. 25. he doth say something towards it; yet S. *Augustin* in another place supposes that these Disciples did both eat and drink. *The Disciples did not know him, but in the breaking of Bread; and truely he that doth not eat and drink Judgment to himself, doth in the breaking of Bread own Christ.* Where it is plain, that he applies both, to the breaking of Bread here spoken of. Tract. 2. in Epist. S. Joh.

4. He saith, *it was the Custom of the Primitive Christians to give it under one kind to Children, the Sick, and to Men in a journey.* I would he had produced his Authorities to prove these things; for I can bring several to prove the direct contrary as to Children, and Sick persons, and Travellers, and not only Ancient Writers, but the most Learned of their own Church. And therefore I cannot but wonder to find him saying, *This was attested by all Ancient Writers, and Modern Historians.* But I have ever found those have been most mistaken, who produce *all Writers and Historians*; when it may be, there is not one that speaks home to the business. At least, we have here none mentioned, and therefore none to examin; and it would be too hard a task to search *All.*

5. He adds to this extravagancy, in saying, *That Receiving in one or both kinds, was indifferent for the first Four hundred years*; when the contrary is so manifest, that the most ingenuous of their own Writers confess it. If any persons did carry home one kind (which is very que-

queſtionable; for *Baronius* and *Alba ſpinæus* ſay, they carried both Kinds) to receive it in times of Perſecution, at what ſeaſon they thought fit afterwards; This ought not to be ſet up againſt the general and conſtant Rule of the Church; which is atteſted, not only by *Caſſander* and ſuch like, but even by *Salmero*, *Ruardus*, *Tapperus*, and *Lindanus*, who make no ſcruple of ſaying, The publick Celebration in the Primitive Church was in both Kinds. But then, how is it poſſible for us to judge better, what they thought themſelves bound to do, than what they conſtantly obſerved in all their publick Celebrations? The Church is not accountable for the particular Fancies or Superſtitions of Men; but what was obſerved in all publick Offices, we have reaſon to think the Church thought it ſelf obliged ſo to do, out of regard to the Inſtitution of Chriſt. And to ſhew how Univerſal this Obſervation was in the Church, thoſe who give account of the *Eaſtern* Church ſay, That the *Greeks*, *Neſtorians*, *Armenians*, *Maronites*, *Cophtites* and *Abyſſins*, do all obſerve it ſtill, *viz.* That the publick Communicants do partake of both Kinds. And not one of all theſe Churches but think themſelves bound to obſerve it, out of regard to the Inſtitution of Chriſt; and why then ſhould any think the Primitive Church thought it indifferent?

Cotovic. Itiner. Hieroſolymit. l. 2. c. 6. Hiſtoir. Critique, p. 14.

6. The firſt Precept of receiving under both Kinds, was given to the Faithful by Pope *Leo*, *A. D.* 443. and confirmed by *Gelaſius*, *A. D.* 490. This is a great miſtake, for *Leo* gave no Precept about it; but only told the people how they might certainly diſcover the *Manichees*, for they would conform in other things, but they would not taſte of the Wine: which argued, that all other Communicants did then partake in both Kinds. *Gelaſius* not only confirms the Cuſtom then uſed, but he ſaith, That it is Sacriledge to divide that Holy Myſtery. And ſurely he did not account Sacriledge an Indifferent thing.

7. Laſtly,

7. Laſtly he ſaith, *That thoſe who receive in one Kind, are truely partakers of the whole Sacrament.* This is a new way of Concomitancy; we uſed to hear of *Whole Chriſt* under either ſpecies, and that *Whole Chriſt* was therefore received; But how comes it to be *the whole Sacrament*, which conſiſts of two diſtinct Parts? And if it be a Sacrifice, the Blood muſt be ſeparated from the Body, elſe the Blood of Chriſt is not conſidered as ſhed, and ſo the Notion of the Sacrifice will be loſt; Which is our next Head. P. 52.

XXII. *Of the MASS.*

UNder this Head, which is thought of ſo great Conſequence in the *Roman* Church, I expected a fuller Repreſentation than I here find; as about the *Opus Operatum, i. e.* how far the meer Act is effectual; About their *Solitary Maſſes*, when no Perſon receives but the Prieſt; About the People having ſo little to do, or underſtand, in all the other parts of the *Maſs*; About the Rites and Ceremonies of the *Maſs*, how uſeful and important they are; About reconciling the preſent Canon of the *Maſs*, with the preſent Practiſes; About offering up *Maſſes* for the honour of Saints. All which we find in the Council of *Trent*, but are omitted by our *Repreſenter*; Who ſpeaks of the *Maſs*, as though there were no Controverſy about it, but only concerning the Sacrifice there ſuppoſed to be offered up, and which he is far from true Repreſenting; For the Council of *Trent* not only affirms a true proper propitiatory Sacrifice to be there offered up for the quick and dead, but denounces Anathema's againſt thoſe that deny it. So that the Queſtion is not, Whether the Euchariſt may not in the ſenſe of Antiquity be allow'd to be a Commemorative Sacrifice, as it takes in the whole Action; but whether in the *Maſs* there Seſſ. 22. cap. 1. can. 1, 2, 3, &c.

there be such a Representation made to God of Christ's Sacrifice, as to be it self a true and Propitiatory Sacrifice for the Sins of the Quick and the Dead?

Now, all that our *Representer* saith to the purpose, is,

P. 53. 1. *That Christ bequeathed his Body and Blood at his last Supper, under the Species of Bread and Wine, not only a Sacrament, but also a Sacrifice.* I had thought it had been more proper to have offered a Sacrifice, than to have bequeathed it. And this ought to have been proved, as the Foundation of this Sacrifice, *viz.* That Christ did at his last Supper offer up his Body and Blood, as a Propitiatory Sacrifice to God. And then what need his suffering on the Cross?

2. *He gave this in charge to his Apostles, as the first and chief Priests of the New-Testament, and to their Successors, to offer.* But Where? When? and How? For we read nothing at all of it in Scripture. *Christ indeed did bid them do the same thing he had there done in his last Supper.* But did he then offer up himself, or not? If not, How can the Sacrifice be drawn from his Action? If he did, it is impossible to prove the necessity of his dying afterwards.

3. *This Sacrifice was never questioned till of late years.* We say, it was never determined to be a Propitiatory Sacrifice, till of late. We do not deny the Fathers interpreting *Mal.* 1. 11. of an Offering under the Gospel; but they generally understand it of Spiritual and Ecclesiastical Sacrifices; and although some of them, by way of Accommodation, do apply it to the Eucharist, yet not one of them doth make it a Propitiatory Sacrifice, which was the thing to be proved: For, we have no mind to dispute about Metaphorical Sacrifices, when the Council of *Trent* so positively decrees it to be a True, Proper, and Propitiatory Sacrifice.

Eucharistical

XXIII. Of

XXIII. *Of* PURGATORY.

HEre our Author begins with proving from Scripture and Antiquity, and then undertakes to explain the Doctrine of *Purgatory* from ſubſtantial Reaſons.

1. As to his Proof from Scripture.

1. Is that from 2 *Maccab.* c. 12. where he ſaith, *Money was ſent to Jeruſalem, that Sacrifices might be offered for the ſlain; and 'tis recommended as a Holy Cogitation, to pray for the dead.*

To this, which is the main foundation of *Purgatory*, I anſwer, 1. It can never prove ſuch a *Purgatory* as our Author aſſerts; For he ſuppoſes *a Sinner reconciled to God, as to eternal Puniſhment*, before he be capable of *Purgatory*; but here can be no ſuch ſuppoſition; for theſe Men died in the ſin of *Achan*, which was not known till their Bodies were found among the ſlain. Here was no Confeſſion, or any ſign of Repentance, and therefore if it proves any thing, it is *deliverance from Eternal Puniſhment*, and for ſuch as dye in their Sins without any ſhew of Repentance. 2. We muſt diſtinguiſh the Fact of *Judas* from the interpretation of *Jaſon*, or his Epitomizer. The Fact of *Judas* was according to the ſtrictneſs of the Law, which required in ſuch Caſes *a Sin-Offering*; and that is all which the *Greek* implies, Ἀπέστειλεν εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα προσαγαγεῖν περὶ ἁμαρτίας θυσίαν. And ſo *Leo Allatius* confeſſes all the beſt *Greek* Copies agree; and he reckons Twelve of them. Now what doth this imply, but that *Judas* remembring the ſevere puniſhment of this Sin in the Caſe of *Achan*, upon the People, ſent a Sin-offering to *Jeruſalem*? But ſaith *Leo Allatius*, *It was the ſin of thoſe men that were ſlain.* I grant it. But the Queſtion is, Whether *the Sin-offering* reſpected the dead or the living? For the Law in ſuch a Caſe required *a Sin-offering for the*

P. 57.

Leo Allat. de Purgat. p. 889.

Levit. 4. 13.

Congregation. And why ſhould not we believe ſo punctual a Man for the Law, as *Judas*, did ſtrictly obſerve it in this point? *But the Author of the Book of* Macchabees *underſtands it of thoſe that were ſlain.* I do not deny it; but then 3. We have no Reaſon to rely upon his Authority in this matter; which I ſhall make appear by a parallel Inſtance. He doth undoubtedly commend the fact of *Razias* in *Killing himſelf* (2 Macc. 14. 42.) when he ſaith he did it ἀνδρικῶς, *like a brave Man*; and if he had thought it a fault in him, he would never have given ſuch a Character of it, but he would have added ſomething of Caution after it. And it is no great advantage to *Purgatory*, for him that commends Self-murder to have introduced it. The moſt probable account I can give of it is, That the *Alexandrian Jews*, of whoſe number *Jaſon* of *Cyrene* ſeems to have been, had taken in ſeveral of the Philoſophical Opinions, eſpecially the *Platoniſts*, into their Religion, as appears by *Philo*; and *Bellarmine* himſelf confeſſes, that *Plato* held a *Purgatory*; and they were ready to apply what related to the Law, to their Platonick Notions. So here the Law appointed a Sin-offering with reſpect to the Living; but *Jaſon* would needs have this refer to the dead; and then ſets down his own remark upon it, That *it was a holy cogitation to pray for the dead*; as our Author renders it. If it were *holy* with reſpect to the Law, there muſt be ſome ground for it in the Law. And that we appeal to: and do not think any particular Fancies ſufficient to introduce ſuch a Novelty as this was; which had no Foundation either in the Law or the Prophets. And it would be ſtrange for a new Doctrine to be ſet up, when the Spirit of Prophecy was ceaſed among them.

Bellar. de Purgat. l. 1. c. 8.

P. 55. *But S.* Auguſt. *held theſe Books for Canonical*, and ſaith, *they are ſo received by the Church*, l. 18. *de Civit Dei.* To anſwer this, it is ſufficient to obſerve, not only the different opinions of

of others before mentioned as to these Books: But that as *Canus* notes, it was then lawful to doubt of their Authority: And he goes as low as *Gregory* I. Whom he denies not to have rejected them. And I hope we may set the Authority of one against the other; especially when S. *Austin* himself, being pressed hard with the fact of *Razias*, confesses, 1. *That the Jews have not the Book of* Maccabees *in their Canon, as they have the Law, the Prophets, and the Psalms, to whom our Lord gave Testimony as to his Witnesses.* Which is an evident Proof, he thought not these Books sufficient to ground a Doctrine upon, which was not found in the other. 2. *That however this Book was not unprofitably received by the Church, if it be soberly read and heard.* Which implies a greater Caution than S. *Austin* would ever have given, concerning a Book he believed truely Canonical. But saith *Bellarmin*, *his meaning is only to keep men from imitating the Example of Razias*; whereas that which they pressed S. *Austin* with, was not meerly the Fact, but the *Character* that is given of it. *Sanctarum Scripturarum Auctoritate laudatus est Razias*, are their very Words in S. *Austin*. And therefore the Caution relates to the Books, and not meerly to his Example. And he lessens the Character given by the Author, when he saith, *He chose to dye nobly*; *It had been better*, saith he, *to have died humbly. But the other is the Elogium given in the Heathen Histories, and better becomes brave Heathens, than true Martyrs.* Can any one now think S. *Austin* believed this Writer Divinely inspired, or his Doctrine sufficient to ground a point of Faith upon? And I wonder they should not every jot as well commend *Self-Murder* as an *Heroical Act*, as prove the Doctrine of *Purgatory* from these words of *Jason*, or his Epitomizer. For the Argument from the Authority of the Book, will hold as strongly for one as the other. And yet this is the *Achilles* for *Purgatory*; which *Natalis Alexander* (whom

Can. l. 2. c. 10. ad 4.

Aug. cont 2d. Epist Gaudent l. 2. c. 23.

De Purgat. l. 1. c. 3.

Natal. Alex. Sec. 4. Diſſ. 4. our Author follows in this matter) ſaith, *is a Demonſtrative Place againſt thoſe that deny it.* But I muſt proceed.

P. 56. 2. *Purgatory is plainly intimated by our Saviour*, Matt. 12. 32. *Whoſoever ſpeaketh againſt the Holy-Ghoſt, it ſhall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, neither in the world to come. By which words, Chriſt evidently ſuppoſes, that ſome ſins are forgiven in the world to come.* I am ſo far from diſcerning this plain intimation, that I wonder how any came to think of it out of this place. Well! *But doth it not hence follow; that Sins may be forgiven in the World to come?* Not near ſo plainly, as that Sins will not be forgiven in the World to come. *Not That particular Sin, but others may*; How doth that appear? What intimation is there, that any Sins not forgiven here, ſhall be forgiven there? Or that any Sins here remitted as to the Eternal Puniſhment, ſhall be there remitted as to the Temporal? And without ſuch a kind of Remiſſion, nothing can be inferred from hence. *But if there be a Remiſſion in another World, it can be neither in Heaven nor Hell, therefore it muſt be in Purgatory.* But thoſe who own a Remiſſion of Sins in another World, ſay it will be on the Day of Judgment: For the actual Deliverance of the Juſt from Puniſhment, may be not improperly called the full Remiſſion of their Sins. So S. *Auguſtin*, whom he quotes, plainly ſaith, *Si nulla remitterentur in judicio illo noviſſimo, &c.* c. *Julian*, l. 6. c. 5. whereût is evident S. *Auguſtin* takes this place to relate to the Day of Judgment; and ſo in the other, (*De Civit. Dei* l. 21. c. 24.) But as he ſuppoſed a Remiſſion, ſo he did a Purgation as *by Fire* in that day. *In illo judicio pœnas quaſdam purgatorias futuras. De Civit. Dei l.* 20. *c.* 25. And ſo he is to be underſtood on *Pſal.* 37. to which he applies 1 *Cor.* 3. 15. But our Author was very much out, when he ſaith S. *Auguſtin* applied 1 *Pet.* 3. 15. to ſome place

place of temporal Chaſtiſement in another World, when *Bellarmin* ſets himſelf to confute S. *Auguſtin* about it, as underſtanding it of this World. And therefore he hath little cauſe to boaſt of S. *Auguſtins* Authority about *Purgatory*, unleſs he had brought ſomething more to the purpoſe out of him. His other Teſtimonies of Antiquity are not worth conſidering; which he borrows from *Natalis Alexander*; that of *Dionyſius Areopag. Eccl. Hierarch.* c. 7. is a known Counterfeit, and impertinent, relating to a Region of Reſt and Happineſs. And ſo do *Tertullians* Oblations for the dead, *De Cor. Milit.* c. 3. For they were Euchariſtical, as appears by the Ancient Liturgies, being made for the greateſt Saints. St. *Cyprian* Ep. 66. ſpeaks of an Oblation for the dead; and he there mentions the *Natalitia* of the Martyrs; but by comparing that with his *Epiſt.* 33. it will be found that he ſpeaks of the Anniverſary Commemoration of the dead, which ſignifies nothing to Purgatory; for the beſt men were put into it; and St. *Cyprian* threatens it as a Puniſhment to be left out of the *Diptychs*; but ſurely it is none to eſcape Purgatory; *Arnobius*, *l.* 4. only ſpeaks of praying for the dead, which we deny not to have been then uſed in the Church, not with reſpect to any temporary pains in *Purgatory*, but to the Day of Judgment: And therein lies the true ſtate of the Controverſie, with reſpect to Antiquity; which is not, Whether any ſolemn prayers were not then made for the dead; But whether thoſe prayers did relate to their deliverance out of a ſtate of Puniſhment before the Day of Judgment: For whatever ſtate Souls were then ſuppoſed to be in, before the great Day, if there could be no deliverance till the Day of Judgment, it ſignifies nothing to the preſent Queſtion.

Bell. de An. Chriſti l. 4. c. 13.

As to the Viſion of *Perpetua* concerning her Brother *Dinocrates*, who died at Seven Years old, being baptized, it

it is hardly reconcilable to their own Doctrine, to ſuppoſe ſuch a Soul in Purgatory; I will not deny that *Perpetua* did think ſhe ſaw him in a worſe condition; and thought likewiſe that by her Prayers ſhe brought him into a better; for ſhe ſaw him playing like little children; and then ſhe awaked, and concluded that ſhe had given him eaſe: But is it indeed come to this, that ſuch a Doctrine as Purgatory muſt be built on ſuch a Foundation as this? I do not call in queſtion the Acts of *Perpetua*, nor her ſincerity in relating her Dream; but muſt the Church build her Doctrines upon the Dreams or Viſions of Young Ladies, tho very devout? for *Vbia Perpetua* was then but Twenty Two, as ſhe ſaith her ſelf. But none are to be blamed, who make uſe of the beſt ſupports their Cauſe will afford.

It is time now to ſee what ſtrength of Reaſon he offers for *Purgatory*. 1. He ſaith, *When a Sinner is reconciled to God, tho the eternal Puniſhment due to his ſins is always remitted, yet there ſometimes remains a temporal Penalty to be undergone; as in the caſe of the* Iſraelites, *and* David. P. 57. But doth it hence follow, that there is a Temporal Penalty that muſt be undergone either here or hereafter, without which there will be no need of *Purgatory*? Who denies, that God in this Life, for example ſake, may puniſh thoſe whoſe ſins he hath promiſed to remit as to another World? This is therefore a very ſlender Foundation. 2. *There are ſome ſins of their own nature light and venial.* I will not diſpute that; but ſuppoſe there be, muſt men go then into Purgatory for mere Venial Sins? What a ſtrange Doctrine doth this appear to any Mans Reaſon? That God ſhould forgive the greater ſins, and require ſo ſevere a puniſhment for ſins in their own Nature venial; *i. e.* ſo inconſiderable in their Opinion, that no man is bound to confeſs them; which do not interrupt a State of Grace; which require only an implicite deteſtation

teſtation of them; which do not deſerve eternal puniſhment; which may be remitted by Holy Water, or a Biſhops Bleſſing, as their Divines agree. 3. *That to all ſins ſome Penalty is due to the Juſtice of God.* And what follows from hence but the Neceſſity of Chriſts Satisfaction? But how doth it appear, that after the Expiation of Sin by Chriſt, and the remiſſion of eternal Puniſhment, there ſtill remains a neceſſity of farther ſatisfaction for ſuch a temporal penalty in another World? 4. *That generally ſpeaking, few men depart out of this Life, but either with the guilt of venial ſins, or obnoxions to ſome Temporal puniſhment*; No doubt all men are obnoxious by their ſins to the puniſhment of another World; but that is not the point, but whether God hath declared, That altho he remits the eternal puniſhment, he will not the temporal; and altho he will forgive thouſands of pounds, he will not the pence and farthings we owe to him: But if Mortal ſins be remitted as to the guilt, and Venial do not hinder a State of Grace, what room is there for Vindictive Juſtice in *Purgatory*?

S. Th. part. 3. q. 87. art 3. in cor. v. Marſil. Column. Hydragiolog. Sect. 7. c. 3. n. 32. Sect. 3. c. 2. n. 15. 29. c. 3. n. 1. Bell. de Cultu. Sanct. l. 3. c. 7. *Sect.* ſecundo.

Yet this is the Doctrine which ſo much weight is laid upon; that *Bellarmine* ſaith, *They muſt go directly to Hell, who do not believe Purgatory.* If this be true, why was it not put into the *Repreſentation*, that we might underſtand the danger of not believing ſo credible, ſo reaſonable a Doctrine as this? But we believe it to be a much more dangerous thing to condemn others for not believing a Doctrine which hath ſo very ſlender a pretence either to Scripture or Reaſon.

De Purgatorio l. 1. c. 11. SS. Hæc ſunt.

XXIV. *Of Praying in an unknown Tongue.*

THE Queſtion in ſhort is, Whether the Church-Service, at which Perſons are bound to aſſiſt, ought not to be in a Language underſtood by thoſe who are bound to aſſiſt? For

P. 59. For our Author grants, *That a Papiſt is bound to aſſiſt at the Church-Service, and to hear* Maſs; but he is not bound to underſtand the Words there ſpoken.

This is a plain ſtate of the caſe; and one would have thought St. *Pauls* Diſcourſe about Edification in the Church-Service, and a known Tongue, and the Primitive practice, had deſerved a little conſideration, but not a Word is ſaid to either of them; and the whole is ſo managed, as tho there had been no Rule, or any appearance of practice to the contrary. But I muſt conſider what he doth ſay.

1. *The Maſs is a Sacrifice*: And what then? Have they no other Church-Service but the *Maſs*? What then becomes of their Breviaries, Litanies, and all other Offices? But ſuppoſe the Prieſts Office in the *Maſs*, be to offer the Sacrifice; are there no Prayers in the Canon of the *Maſs*, wherein the people are concerned? Why muſt not they underſtand what they are required to aſſiſt in *Prayer* for? If they have *Engliſh* Books, as he ſaith, to teach them
P. 61. every part and Ceremony of the *Maſs*, why not as well the Prayers in the *Maſs*, wherein they are to join? They tell us, *It is unſeaſonable then for the People to ſay their Beads, and other Devotions*: And I ſuppoſe as unſeaſonable to talk, or think of other matters. Why then ſhould not they know what it is they are to do, and what Petitions they are then to make to God? Are there no Reſponſes to be made? No Leſſons to be read? No Creed to be profeſſed? Doth not the Prieſt ſpeak to the people to pray, and they anſwer him? Is there no Thankſgiving after the Communion which the people is concerned in? We are as much for *their Devout Affections*, as they can be; but we think they are not hindred by underſtanding what they are about: We cannot but wonder, that
P. 60. any man ſhould ſay, *That it nothing concerns his Devotion,*
P. 61. *that the* Maſs *is in* Latin, if he underſtand it not. Is it

no

no part of Devotion to join in the publick prayers, not merely by rote, but from a due apprehenſion of the matter contained in them? He requires, *That they accompany the Prieſt in Prayer and Spirit*: And why not in underſtanding alſo? *But the Church hath ſo ordered it*: And that is the thing we complain of, as done againſt St. *Paul*, againſt the Primitive Church, againſt the natural ſenſe of Mankind, who think it is fit for them to know what they do, eſpecially in the Worſhip of God: *But it is to preſerve Unity*: Methinks however Unity in Spirit and Underſtanding is better than without it: *There are other good Reaſons*: I know not one good one; and if there were more, he would have produced them: *The greateſt part is ſaid in a low voice, that it is not poſſible he ſhould hear it*: And to what purpoſe ſhould it be ſpoken louder, if they are not to underſtand it? But why ſo low in publick? Yet the people might have Books, and join, if they underſtood what was ſaid. But why ſhould not the reſt be underſtood, which is ſpoken as if it were.

2. As to other Offices, he ſaith, *He is taught, that he* P. 62. *may perform them in a Language which he underſtands not, with great benefit to his Soul, and the acceptance of God, if in thoſe occaſions he endeavours to raiſe his thoughts to Heaven, and fix his heart upon his Maker.* But the Queſtion is not, Whether a Man may not have devout Thoughts at that time, but whether he can perform his part in the publick Offices, with true Devotion, without Underſtanding? For the publick Offices of Devotion were deſigned for the uniting the Hearts and Deſires of the people in the ſame things. It is not, Whether one Man may not pray for Heaven, and another for fair Weather, and another for pardon of his Sins, and a Fourth for Patience, and ſo on, in the ſame place, and at the ſame time; for all this may be done as well in a *ſilent Meeting*, where not a Word is ſpoken: But there being one Form of Prayer for all to join toge-

ther in, that with the united force of the whole Congregation, their Petitions may go up to Heaven; The Matter now in dispute is, Whether it be not necessary in order to this united Devotion, that the people all know what they pray for? And one would think nothing need to be said to prove this: But what our Author adds in justification of this, overthrows all publick Devotion; For he saith, *It is not necessary to have attention on the Words, or on the Sense of Prayers, but rather purely on God*: Which is to make all publick Forms unnecessary, and to turn all Devotion into *Prayer* of *Contemplation*: For if this be true, all Forms whatsoever, are not only useless, but burdensom; and by the stinting the Spirit, do hinder the nimbler flights of the Soul, in pure silence towards God: And this Principle must lead men to *Enthusiasms*, and unintelligible Unions, and make them despise *Forms* as a mean and dull Dispensation.

But at last he saith, *A Petitioner may accompany his Petition with an earnest desire of obtaining it, tho the Language in which it is written, be unknown to him.* Very true, if he indited the matter of the Petition, and trusted another to put it into that Language, which the Person to whom he makes it, doth understand, but not his own: But all Languages are alike to Gods Infinite Wisdom, and so there can be no pretence on that account, to keep only to some particular Tongues, tho unknown to the Party; and if it were so to all men, no man would have a Petition presented in a Language which he did not know: But in Prayer to God, the design of it is not to acquaint him with something which he knew not, but to excite the hearts and affections of men to an earnest desire of the things which are fit for them to ask; Now let any man undertake to prove, that mens affections are as easily moved by Words they do not understand, as by those they do; and I will give up this Cause.

XXV. *Of*

XXV. *Of the Second Commandment.*

THE Diſpute about this is not, Whether the Second Commandment may be found in any of their Books, but by what Authority it comes to be left out in any: As he confeſſes it is *in their ſhort Catechiſms and Manuals*: But not only in theſe; for I have now before me the Reformed Office of the Bleſſed Virgin, Printed at *Salamanca*, *A. D.* 1588. publiſhed by Order of *Pius* V. where it is ſo left out: And ſo in the Engliſh Office at *Antwerp*, *A. D.* 1658. I wiſh he had told us in what publick Office of their Church it is to be found: But himſelf pleads for the leaving it out, when he ſaith, *The People are in no danger of Superſtition or Idolatry by it; ſince the Firſt Commandment ſecures them from it; and there is nothing in this, but what is vertually contained in the Firſt, and is rather an Explanation, than a new and diſtinct Precept.* But is this ſo plain and clear, that a Mans Conſcience can never make any juſt and reaſonable Doubt concerning it? There is a terrible ſanction after it; and men had need go upon very good Grounds in a matter of ſuch moment. Hath God himſelf any where declared this to be only an Explication of the Firſt Commandment? Have the Prophets, or Chriſt and his Apoſtles ever done it? How then can any mans Conſcience be ſafe in this matter? For it is not a trifling Controverſie, whether it be a diſtinct Commandment, or an Explication of the Firſt; but the Lawfulneſs or Unlawfulneſs of the Worſhip of Images depends very much upon it: For if it be only an Explication of the Firſt, then unleſs *one takes Images to be Gods*, their Worſhip is lawful, and ſo the Heathens were excuſed in it, who were not ſuch Ideots; But if it be a new and diſtinct Precept, then the Worſhipping any Image or Similitude, becomes a grievous

P. 63.

P. 64.

ſin, and expoſes men to the Wrath of God in that ſevere manner mentioned in the end of it. And it is a great confirmation that this is the true meaning of it, becauſe all the Primitive Writers of the Chriſtian Church, not only thought it a Sin againſt this Commandment, but inſiſted upon the force of it againſt thoſe Heathens who denied that they took their Images for Gods: And therefore this is a very inſufficient Account of leaving out the *Second Commandment.*

XXVI. *Of Mental Reſervations.*

UNder this Head he denies Two Things.

1. That they are ever taught to break Faith with Hereticks.

2. That their Church doth allow any Equivocations, or Mental Reſervations.

As to the former I am ſincerely glad to find a Principle ſo deſtructive to all humane Society, ſo utterly diſowned, when he ſaith, *He is taught to keep Faith with all ſorts of People, of whatſoever judgment or perſuaſion they be; and to ſtand to his Word, and obſerve his Promiſe given, or made to any whatſoever.* And whatever Opinions and Practices there may have been of that kind formerly, we hope there will never be occaſion given to revive that diſpute. P. 64.

2. As to the Second, We embrace his Declaration againſt it, and hope there is no Equivocation, or mental Reſervation in it. But there are ſome things which muſt here be taken Notice of.

1. He cannot deny that there are Authors in Communion with his Church, which may be charged with teaching another Doctrine; and thoſe not a few, nor inconſiderable; who not only allow the Practice of Mental Reſer-

Reſervations and Equivocations, but ſay with great confidence, it hath been received in the *Roman* Church for no leſs than Four hundred years; and that in ſome Caſes they are all ſtill agreed in it. See *Parſons* Treatiſe of *Mitigation*, *c.* 7. *Sect.* 2. 3. *c.* 10. *Sect.* 1.

2. We do not deny, that *Innocent* XI. hath condemned Equivocations, and Mental Reſervations in Swearing, as *at leaſt Scandalous and Pernicious in Practiſe*; and therefore we cannot charge the Pope with abetting this Doctrine. But we cannot but reflect on what our Author ſaid about the Depoſing Doctrine, *That although Popes had believed it, and acted by it, yet the greater number oppoſed it.* And what ſhall we ſay in this Caſe, if the Generality of their Caſuiſts in ſome Caſes approve it, and think it no *Lie or Perjury*, as in that of *Confeſſion*; but if it be really ſo in any one Caſe, then it may be ſome other fault, but it is not a *Lie or Perjury* in any other, when a Man doth not think himſelf bound to ſpeak all he knows.

3. That as we highly commend the Popes condemning ſuch Doctrines and Practiſes now; ſo we have Reaſon to think the contrary did not once want the encouragement and approbation of the *Roman See*. As may be found in the Reſolution of ſome Caſes by *Pius* V. relating to ſome *Miſſionaries*, who were to be ſent hither; and then it was declared, That if they were ſummon'd before our Judges, they might *Sophiſtice Jurare & Sophiſtice Reſpondere*; and that they were not bound to anſwer according to the Intention of the Judges, but according to ſome true ſenſe of their own, *i. e.* which was made true by the help of a Mental Reſervation. But it is very well, that now the very ſame things are condemned at *Rome*, as *Scandalous and Pernicious in Practiſe*.

Apud G. Abbot de Mendacio, &c. in Præf. p. 6, &c.

XXVII. *Of a Death-Bed Repentance.*

WE have no difference with them about this matter, as far as they hold to theſe points: 1. That Men are ſtrictly obliged to Work out their Salvation with
P. 67, 68. fear and trembling in time of Health. 2. That it is very dangerous to defer their Repentance to the laſt. 3. That if any are ſurprized, they ought in Charity to have all poſſible aſſiſtance, to put them into the beſt way for their Salvation.

But yet there may be ſome particular Doctrines owned in the Church of *Rome*, which may give men too much encouragement to put off true Repentance; as 1. The eaſineſs of being put into a ſtate of Grace by the Sacrament of Penance; for which no more is required than removing the impediment; as appears by the Council of *Trent. Seſſ.* 7. *Can.* 6. and afterwards it defines that bare Attrition doth ſufficiently diſpoſe a Man to receive Grace in that Sacrament, *Seſſ.* 14. *c.* 4. So that altho a Man hath led a very bad Life, if he hath but this Attrition for his ſins when he doth confeſs them, he is put into a ſtate of Grace by this Sacrament. And what can any Man expect more, and what can he do leſs! I do not mean a bare natural Attrition, the ſufficiency whereof is condemned by *Innocent* XI. in the ſame Propoſition, Fifty ſeventh; but that which the Council of *Trent* calls *Imperfect Contrition, i. e.* a good Motion in a Mans mind to forſake his Sins for fear of Puniſhment; if really no more be required for a ſtate of Grace but this, it is no wonder if Men put off the doing of that which may be done at any time ſo eaſily by the help of a Prieſt.

2. The Treaſure of the Church is another thing which is very apt to hinder Mens ſpeedy Repentance; for by that they believe there is a ſtock ready of ſo many Merits

and

and Satisfactions of others, if duely applied to them by Indulgences, that they need not be at ſuch pains to Work out their own Salvation with fear and trembling. When a Man by the Sacrament of Penance is put into a ſtate of Grace, the Eternal Puniſhment is diſcharged, and nothing remains but ſome Temporal Pains; and to eaſe him of theſe he hath many helps, but eſpecially the Treaſure of the Church, which the Pope hath the diſpenſing of, as he is bound to believe; and by Indulgences he may eaſily get off ſome Thouſands of years of Purgatory-Pains; and if theſe ſhould fail him, there is another help yet left, which is leaving a ſtock for Prayers for his Soul when he dies; *which*, even our Author aſſures him, *are very available towards his ſpeedier releaſe out of Purgatory*, p. 58.

XXVIII. *Of FASTING.*

THE Queſtion here is, Whether a Man doth not obſerve their Churches Command about Faſting, who forbears all forbidden things, but takes liberty in thoſe which are not forbidden?

It is not, Whether they may not break the Commands of God, againſt Gluttony and Drunkenneſs; But whether they break the Law of the Church about Faſting? And notwithſtanding what our Author hath ſaid, I ſee no Reaſon for the Affirmative. I do not deny, 1. That it is a very indifferent ſort of Faſting, *to abſtain from Fleſh, unleſs all other ſorts of Exceſſes at the ſame time be carefully avoided.* P. 69. 2. *That Exceſſes on ſuch days are more ſcandalous, becauſe there is a pretence of Faſting.* 3. *That God's Command doth at all times forbid Intemperance.* P. 71. Which are the chief things he inſiſts upon. But yet this doth not reach the point, which is about their *Churches Command.* For their Caſuiſts diſtinguiſh Faſting into

into 1. *Natural*; which is total Abſtinence; and this is required only in order to receiving the Euchariſt. 2. *Moral*; which is the ſame with Temperance, or Faſting for Health. 3. *Eccleſiaſtical*; which is defined by them to be, *An Abſtinence from Food forbidden by the Church.* And if this Definition be true, it cannot be broken but by eating what the Church hath prohibited.

And therefore their Caſuiſts, as far as I can find, are agreed in theſe things,

1. That a Man may eat a full Meal of what is not forbidden, and not break the Churches Precept of Faſting, provided Veſpers be firſt ſaid. And the later Caſuiſts blame *Covarruvias* for making any ſcruple about it. *If a Mans Exceſs comes to be a Mortal ſin; yet for all that,* ſaith *Reginaldus, He ſhall not be judged as a breaker of his Faſt.* Nay, *Leſſius* goes further, and ſaith, *He doth not loſe the Merit of Faſting. Quamvis aliquis multum excedet non ſolvit Jejunium,* ſaith *Card. Tolet.* And *Paulus Zacchias* ſaith, *This is the common Opinion*; and he thinks the *Intention* of the *Church is ſufficiently anſwered.* And ſo doth *Paſqualigus* in his *Praxis* of Faſting.

2. A Man may drink Wine, or other drink, as often as he pleaſeth, without breaking his Faſt. He may *toties quoties bibere,* ſaith *Diana. Zach. Paſqualigus,* who hath Written moſt fully on this Subject, ſhews, *That it is the general Opinion, that no quantity of Wine or other drink, though taken without any Neceſſity, is a violation of the Precept of Faſting; no, not although the Wine be taken for nouriſhment, becauſe the Church doth not forbid it; but this laſt,* he ſaith, *is not the general, but the more probable Opinion.*

3. A Man may eat ſomething when he drinks, to prevent its doing him hurt; beſides his good Meal, he may take what quantity he pleaſes of Sweet-meats or Fruit; he may have a good Refection at Night, and yet not break this

Reginald. Praxis l. 4. c. 14. n. 163. Leſſ. de Juſtit. l. 4. c. 2. Dub. 2. n. 10. Inſtruct. Sacerd. l. 6. c. 2. n. 4. P. Zacch. Qu. Medico. legales l. 5. tit. 1. Qu. 1. p. 29, 30, 31. Paſqual. Deciſ. 120. n. 5. Dian. Sam. v. Jejun. n. 7. Zach. Paſqualigi. Praxis Jejunii Eccleſ Deciſ. 116. n. 3. Dec. 117. 1, 2, 3.

this ſtrict Precept of Faſting; *For the eating as often as one drinks, it is the common Opinion*, ſaith the ſame Caſuiſt (who was no *Jeſuit*) *That it is not forbidden, becauſe it is taken by way of a Medicine*; and he quotes a great number of their *Caſuiſts* for it. *A Collation at evening is allowed*, ſaith he. And *Leſſius* ſaith, *There is no certain Rule for the Quantity of it.* And *Card. Tolet* ſaith, *very large ones are allowed at* Rome *by the Popes Connivence; even in the Court of* Rome, ſaith *Reginaldus*. And now I leave the Reader to judge of the ſeverity of Faſting required in the Church of *Rome*.

Deciſ. 119. n. 2.
Deciſ. 86. n. 3, 4.
Leſſ. ubi ſupr. n. 11.
Tolet. ubi ſup.
Regin ubi ſup. n. 185.

XXIX. *Of Diviſions and Schiſms in the Church.*

TWO things he ſaith upon this Head.

1. *That they are all agreed in matters of Faith.*

2. *That they only differ in ſome School Points*; from whence he infers, That they have no Schiſms or Separations among them.

But that this is no juſt conſequence, will appear by the Schiſms and Separations among us, made by ſuch who profeſs to agree in all matters of Faith. Yet let us ſee how he proves that they agree in all matters of Faith; *becauſe they agree to ſubmit equally to the Determinations of the Church.*

P. 72.

Now this very way evidently proves that they do not all agree, becauſe they do not equally ſubmit to the Churches determinations. For,

1. Some ſay they are bound to ſubmit to the Churches Determinations, as it repreſents the Univerſal Church; Others ſay no; but as the Churches Power is virtually lodged in the Guides of it. Now this is a very material Difference: For if it be on the former Account, then not the Popes and Councils Declarations are to be regarded, but as they expreſs the ſenſe of the Univerſal Church; and ſo the Majority of Votes, and Numbers

the Repreſentative and Diffuſive Church is chiefly to be regarded. And on this Ground ſome reject the Depoſing-Power, though plainly decreed by Popes and Councils; but they unhinge their Churches Authority by it: Now how is it poſſible for them to agree about matters of Faith, who differ fundamentally about the way how any things come to be matters of Faith. If they be decreed by Popes and Councils, ſay ſome; and ſo the Depoſing Power is become an Article of Faith. No ſuch matter, ſay others, for a greater Number in the diffuſive Church oppoſe it, as in the *Gallican* Church, and elſewhere. Very well! But how then can theſe Parties be ſaid to agree in matters of Faith. and an equal Submiſſion to the Determinations of the Church?

2. Some again ſay, That it is not the conſent of the preſent Church can make any Article of Faith, but there muſt be an univerſal Tradition from the Apoſtles times. And ſo they tell us the Depoſing Power can never be an Article of Faith, becauſe it wants the Conſent of all the Ages before *Gregory* VII. So that upon this Ground there can be no Article of Faith which cannot be proved to be thus delivered down to us. Others again ſay, this is in effect to give up their Cauſe, knowing the impoſſibility of proving particular Points in this manner; and therefore they ſay, the preſent Church is wholly to be truſted for the ſenſe of the foregoing.

Now theſe differences are ſtill on Foot in their Church; and from theſe do ariſe daily diſputes about Matters of Faith, and the Seat of Infallibility, whether in the Guides, or the Body of the Church; if the former, whether in the Church Repreſentative, or Virtual? whether the Perſonal Infallibilty of the Pope be a matter of Faith or not? Our Author ſaith, Not; others ſay, Yes; and yet he ſaith they are agreed in matters of Faith. So that by his own Confeſſion they differ about other things than mere School-Points.

But

But ſuppoſe they were agreed in Articles of Faith, can there be no Schiſms or Diviſions in their Church? What thinks he of all the Schiſms between Popes and Popes? Of all the Schiſms between the Popes and the Emperors Parties? Which were as notorious, and ſcandalous, and miſchievous, as ever were in the World. What thinks he of the Schiſms between the Biſhops and the Regular Orders, which were as croſs and peeviſh towards the Biſhops and Secular Clergy, as our Diſſenters themſelves? And among the Regular Orders, what Heats and Contentions have been, *Not about the practice of a devout Life*, I aſſure him, but about matters of Doctrine; and which both Parties ſeverally plead to be matters of Faith? As in the noted Controverſies of this laſt Age, about the Immaculate Conception of the Bleſſed Virgin, the power of Grace, and the Popes Perſonal Infallibility; and they cannot ſay they are as yet agreed about theſe things.

XXX. *Of Friars and Nuns.*

OUR Diſpute is not, About the lawfulneſs of retiring from the World by ſuch Perſons who are rendred unfit for doing Service in it; and the more they ſpend their time in Devotion and Contemplation, ſo much the better.

But it lies in theſe Things,

1. Whether the Perfection of a Chriſtian State of Life lies in being cloyſtered up from the World, or labouring to do good in it? For this was the great ſnare made uſe of, to draw men into it, becauſe they repreſented this as the moſt perfect ſtate; whereas according to the Doctrine and Example of Chriſt and his Apoſtles, the active Life of doing good, is far beyond it.

2. Whether, altho ſuch a retirement be allowed, it be a thing pleaſing to God, to tye ſuch Perſons up

by indispensable Vows, whatever their Circumstances may be, not to alter that State of Life; who either in Youth, or through Force, Passion, or Discontent, have entred into it? And this may be so much rather questioned, because those who assert the Pope may dispense, go upon this Ground, because Circumstances may alter the obligation of a Vow; and when a greater good is to be attained, it ceaseth to oblige; which to my apprehension doth not prove the Popes Power to dispense, but the dispensable Nature of the Vows themselves.

3ly. Whether all things of this nature being liable in continuance of time, to great Degeneracy and Corruptions; and the numbers of such Places being unserviceable either to Church or State, it be not in the Power of the King and States of the Kingdom, to dissolve and reduce them to ways more suitable to the Conveniencies of both?

As to what he discourses about *Councils of Perfection, the Distractions of the World, the Corruptions of the best Things*, &c. They reach not the main Points, but are only general Topicks, which we are not concerned to debate.

XXXI. *Of Wicked Principles and Practices.*

THE *Misrepresenter* charges the Church of *Rome* with many horrid Practices, as the *French* and *Irish* Massacres, the Murders of Two Kings of *France*, the Holy League, the Gun-powder Treason, &c. And charges these as being done according to the Principles of that Church.

But in Answer to this he saith. 1. In General, *That the Doctrine of it is holy, teaching the Love of God and our neighbour, and that none can be saved by Faith alone.* In which Doctrine we heartily concur with them. 2. *That altho many uncertain things pass for certain, and false for true, yet he cannot deny that all ranks and degrees of men have been corrupted among them, being scandalous in their Lives, wicked.*

P. 77.

P. 79.

in

in their deſigns, without the Fear of God in their hearts, or care of their own Salvation. This is a general Acknowledgment, but no particular Anſwer to the things objected. 3. *That the whole Church is not to be charged for the ſake of ſuch villanies.* Very true, unleſs ſome Doctrine owned in that Church gave encouragement to them: As ſuppoſe any ſhould ever have fallen into Rebellion upon the belief of the Depoſing Power; is not that Doctrine chargeable with the Conſequences of it? They are extremely to blame who charge a Church with what her Members do in direct Oppoſition to her Doctrine; but it is quite another Caſe, when the main Ground they alledg for their Actions is ſome allowed Principle in it. P. 81.

4. *They are not accountable for the Actions of every Biſhop, Cardinal, or Pope; for they extend not their Faith beyond the Declaration of General Councils.* But ſuppoſe General Councils have declared ſuch Doctrines, and Popes act but according to them; is not their Church then accountable for their Actions? P. 82.

5. *There is more Praying and Faſting, and receiving the Sacraments, more viſiting the Priſoners, and the Sick, more Alms-giving in any of our neighbouring Popiſh Towns, as* Paris, Antwerp, Gant, *&c. than in any Ten Towns of the Reformation.* And is there more *Charity* too? It doth not appear, if they be as ready to cenſure others, and admire themſelves, as our Author, who ſo freely gives his Judgment about a matter it is impoſſible for him to know. P. 83.

We ſee no reaſon to admire or imitate the manner of their Praying, and Faſting, and receiving the Sacraments; for to pray without underſtanding, to faſt without Abſtinence, to receive a maimed Sacrament, are things we do not envy them for; But altho our Devotion be not ſo pompous, and full of ſhew, yet We may pray and faſt in ſecret, according to our Saviours Directions, far more than they do; however our People are mightily to blame

blame if they do not understand what they pray for, if they do not receive more of the Sacrament than they; and we verily believe there is as great and remarkable Instances of *true Charity* among those of the Church of *England*, as among any People in the World.

XXXII. *Of MIRACLES.*

P. 83. 1. OUR Author saith, *He is not obliged to believe any one Miracle besides what is in Scripture.*

2. He sees no Reason *to doubt the truth of many Miracles, which are attested by great numbers of Eye-witnesses, examined by Authority, and found upon Record, with all the Formalities due to such a Process.*

Now, how can these two things stand together? Is not a Man obliged to believe a thing so well proved? And if his other Arguments prove any thing, it is, that he is bound to believe them. For he thinks there is as much Reason to believe Miracles still, as in the time of the old or new Law. If he can make this out, I see no reason why he should not be as well obliged to believe them now, as well as those recorded in Scripture. But I can see nothing like a proof of this. And all Persons of Judgment in their own Church, do grant there is a great difference between the Necessity of Miracles for the first establishing a Religion, and afterwards. This is not only asserted by *Tostatus*, *Erasmus*, *Stella*, *Andradius*, and several others formerly; but the very late *French* Author I have several times mentioned, saith it in expres Terms. And he confesses the great Impostures of modern Miracles, which, he saith, ought to be severely punished; and that none but Women and weak People think themselves bound to believe them. And he cannot understand what they are good for: Not to convert Hereticks; because not done among them: Not to prove there are no corruptions

Moyens Surs & Honestes, &c. To. 2. p. 149.

ruptions or errors among them, which is a thing incredible; with much more to that purpoſe, and ſo concludes with *Monſieur Paſchal*, *That if they have no other uſe, we ought not to be amuſed with them.*

But Chriſt promiſed, that his Apoſtles ſhould do greater Miracles than himſelf had done. And what then? Muſt therefore S. *Francis*, or S. *Dominic*, or S. *Roſa*, do as great as the Apoſtles had done? What Conſequence can be drawn from the Apoſtles times to latter Ages? We do not diſpute *God's Omnipotency, or ſay his hand is ſhortned*; but we muſt not from thence infer, that every thing which is called a Miracle is truely ſo; or make uſe of God's Power, to juſtify the moſt incredible ſtories. Which is a way will ſerve as well for a falſe as a true Religion; and *Mahomet* might run to Gods Omnipotency for cleaving the Moon in two pieces, as well as others for removing a Houſe over the Seas, or any thing of a like nature.

But, he ſaith, *their Miracles are not more ridiculous and abſurd than ſome in the Old Teſtament.* Which I utterly deny; but I ſhall not run out into the examination of this Parallel, by ſhewing how very different the Nature, Deſign, and Authority of the Miracles he mentions, is from thoſe which are believed in the *Roman* Church. And it had been but fitting, as he ſet down the Miracles of the *Old Teſtament*, ſo to have mentioned thoſe of the *Roman* Church which were to vye with them; but this he was willing to forbear, for certain good Reaſons. *If moſt of poor Man's Impoſſibles be none to God*, as he concludes, yet every thing is not preſently true which is not impoſſible; and by this way of Arguing, there can be nothing objected againſt the moſt abſurd and idle Fictions of the Golden Legend, which all Men of Underſtanding among themſelves, not only reject for want of Authority, but of Credibility.

XXXIII. *Of Holy Water.*

THE *Misrepresenter* charges him with *approving superstitious* uses of inanimate things, and attributing wonderful effects to them; as Holy-Water, Candles, Oyl, Bread, *&c.*

P. 86. In Answer, our Author 1. declares, *That the Papist truely represented, utterly disapproves all sorts of Superstition.* But if he had designed to have represented truely, he ought to have told us what he meant by Superstition, and whether any Man who observes the Commands of the Church can be guilty of it.

2. He saith, *That these things are particularly deputed by the Prayers and Blessing of the Priest to certain uses for God's Glory, and the Spiritual and Corporal Good of Christians.*

Hydragiolog. Sect. 3. c. 2. 12. p. 45. This is somewhat too general; But *Marsilius Columna*, Archbishop of *Salerno*, who hath taken most pains in this matter, sums them up; 1. *As to Spiritual, they are Seven.* 1. *To fright Devils.* 2. *To remit Venial sins.* 3. *To cure Distractions.* 4. *To elevate the Mind.* 5. *To dispose it for Devotion.* 6. *To obtain Grace.* 7. *To prepare for the Sacrament.*

2. *As to Corporal.* 1. *To cure Barrenness.* 2. *To multiply Goods.* 3. *To procure Health.* 4. *To purge the Air from pestilential Vapours.*

And now, as our Author saith, *What Superstition in the use of it?* He names several things of God's own appointing to Parallel it; as *the Waters of Jealousy*, *the Shew-bread*, *the Tables of Stone*; but the first was miraculous, the other had no such effects that we ever heard of. *Elisha's Salt for sweetning the Water*, was undoubtedly a Miracle. Is the *Holy Water* so? As to the *liver of the Fish for expelling the Devil*, in the Book of *Tobit*, he knows

knows the Book is not owned for Canonical by us; and this very place is produced as an Argument againſt it; there being no Ground from Scripture, to attribute the Power of expelling Devils, to the Liver of a Fiſh, either naturally or ſymbolically: *Valleſius* offers at the only probable account of it, that it muſt be a Divine Power given to it, which the Angel *Raphael* did not diſcover; and yet it is ſomewhat hard to conceive, how this Liver ſhould have ſuch a power to drive away any kind of Devil, as it is there expreſſed, unleſs by a Devil there, no more be meant than ſome violent Diſeaſe, which the *Jews* generally believed to ariſe from the poſſeſſion of evil Spirits: But however here is an Angel ſuppoſed, who made this known to *Tobit*; but we find not *Raphael* to diſcover the virtue of Holy Water againſt Devils. As to *Chriſts uſing Clay to open the eyes of the blind*, it is very improperly applied, unleſs the ſame miraculous Power be ſuppoſed in it, which was in Chriſt himſelf: And ſo is the *Apoſtles laying on of hands, and uſing Oyl for miraculous cures*; unleſs the ſame Gift of Miracles be in every Prieſt which conſecrates Holy Water, which was in the Apoſtles: And *Bellarmine* himſelf confeſſes, *That no infallible effect doth follow the uſe of Holy Water, becauſe there is no Promiſe of God in the caſe, but only the Prayers of the Church*: *But theſe are ſufficient to ſanctifie the Water*, ſaith our Author: And to what end? For all the ſpiritual and corporeal benefits before-mentioned? Is no Promiſe of God neceſſary for ſuch purpoſes as thoſe? How can any Church in the World diſpoſe of Gods Power without his Will? It may appoint ſignificant and decent Ceremonies, but it can never appropriate Divine Effects to them; and to ſuppoſe any Divine Power in things which God never gave them, is in my Opinion, Superſtition; and to uſe them for ſuch ends, is a ſuperſtitious uſe: St. *Cyril*, whom he quotes, ſpeaks of the Conſecration of the Water of

Valleſ. Sacr. Philoſoph. c. 28. p. 229.

De Cultu Sanct. l. 3. c. 7.

Baptiſm, *Catech.* 3. St. *Auguſtine* only of a conſecrated Bread, which the *Catechumens* had (*De Peccat. Merit. & Remiſſ.* l. 2. c. 26.) but he attributes no Divine Effects to it. Pope *Alexanders Epiſtle* is a Notorious Counterfeit. Thoſe Paſſages of *Epiphanius*, *Theodoret*, and *S. Jerom*, all ſpeak of miraculous effects; and thoſe who had the power of Miracles, might ſometimes do them with an external ſign, and ſometimes without, as the Apoſtles cured with anointing, and without: But this is no ground for conſecrating Oyl by the Church, or Holy Water, for miraculous effects. If theſe Effects which they attribute to *Holy Water*, be miraculous, then every Prieſt muſt have not only a power of Miracles himſelf, but of annexing it to the Water he conſecrates; if they be ſupernatural but not miraculous, then Holy Water muſt be made a Sacrament to produce theſe effects *ex opere operato*; if neither one nor the other, I know not how to excuſe the uſe of it from *Superſtition.*

XXXIV. *Of breeding up People in Ignorance.*

THE *Miſrepreſenter* charges them with this, on theſe Acccounts. 1. By keeping their Myſteries of Iniquity from them. 2. By performing Divine Service in an unknown Tongue. 3. By an implicite Faith. To which the *Repreſenter* anſwers. 1. *That they give encouragement to Learning*; and he inſtances *in their Univerſities and Conventual Libraries*; But what is all this to the common People? But their *Indices Expurgatorii, and prohibiting Books ſo ſeverely*, which are not for their Turn, (as we have lately ſeen in the new one of *Paris*) argues no great confidence of their Cauſe, nor any hearty love to Learning: And if it could be rooted out of the World, their Church would fare the better in it; but if it cannot, they muſt have ſome to be able to deal with others in it.

P. 89.

it. 2. As to the common People he ſaith, *They have Books enough to inſtruct them.* Is it ſo in *Spain* or *Italy?* But where they live among Hereticks, as we are called, the People muſt be a little better inſtructed to defend themſelves, and to gain upon others. 3. *If the People did know their Church-Offices and Service,* &c. *they would not find ſuch faults, ſince the Learned approve them.* Let them then try the Experiment, and put the Bible and their Church-Offices every where into the vulgar tongues: But their ſevere Prohibitions ſhew how much they are of another Opinion: What made all that rage in *France* againſt *Voiſins* Tranſlation of the *Miſſal?* ſuch Proceedings of the Aſſembly of the Clergy againſt it; ſuch complaints both to the King and the Pope againſt it, as tho all were loſt, if that were ſuffered? Such an Edict from the King, ſuch a Prohibition from the Pope in ſuch a Tragical Stile about it? Such a Collection of Authors to be printed on purpoſe againſt it? Do theſe things ſhew, even in a Nation of ſo free a Temper, in Compariſon, as the *French*, any mighty Inclination towards the encouraging this Knowledg in the People? And ſince that, what ſtirs have there been about the *Mons* Teſtament? What prohibitions by Biſhops? What vehement oppoſition by others? So that many Volumes have already been written on the occaſion of that Tranſlation. And yet our Author would perſwade us, that if we look abroad, we ſhall find wonderful care taken to keep the People from Ignorance; but we can diſcern much greater to keep them in it.

P. 90.

Collectio Authorum Vulg. Verſionis damnantium Juſſu ac Mandato Cleri Gallicani edita. Lutet. Pariſ. 1661.

XXXV. *Of the Uncharitableneſs of the Papiſts.*

THE *Miſrepreſenter*, (as he is called) charges this Point home, *Becauſe they deny Salvation to thoſe who believe all the Articles of the Chriſtian Faith in the Apoſtles Creed, and lead vertuous and good Lives, if they be not of their Communion.*

P. 92. To this the Repreſenter anſwers in plain terms, *That this is nothing but what they have learnt from the mouth of Chriſt and his Apoſtles.* And to this end he muſters up all their ſayings againſt Infidels, falſe Apoſtles, *Gnoſticks, Cerinthians*, as tho they were point-blank levelled againſt all that live out of the Communion of the Church of *Rome*.

P. 95. But *this is no uncharitableneſs, but pure zeal, and the ſame the Primitive Church ſhewed againſt Hereticks, ſuch as* Marcion, Baſilides, *and* Bardeſanes, *who were condemned in the firſt Age for denying the Reſurrection of the dead*, &c. What in the firſt Age! Methinks the Second had been early enough for them: But this is to let us ſee what Learning there is among you. But do we deny the Reſurrection of the dead? Or hold any one of the Hereſies condemned by the Primitive Church? What then is our Fault, which can merit ſo ſevere a Sentence? *We oppoſe the Church*: What Church? The Primitive Apoſtolical Church? The Church in the time of the Four General Councils? I do not think that will be ſaid, but I am ſure it can never be proved: What Church then? *The preſent Church?* Is it then damnable to oppoſe the preſent Church? But I pray let us know what ye mean by it; *The univerſal Body of Chriſtians in the World?*. No, no, abundance of them are *Hereticks and Schiſmaticks* as well as we: *i. e.* All the Chriſtians in the *Eaſtern* and *Southern* parts, who are not in Communion with the Church of *Rome*: So that two parts in three of Chriſtians, are ſent to Hell by this Principle; and yet it is no uncharitableneſs. But ſuppoſe the Church of *Rome* be *the only true Church*, muſt men be damned preſently for oppoſing its Doctrines? I pray think a little better on it, and you will change your Minds. Suppoſe a Man do not ſubmit to the Guides of this Church in a matter of Doctrine declared by them; Muſt he be Damned? What if it be the Depoſing Power? Yet his Princi-

Principle is, *If a Man do not hold the Faith entire, he is gone.* But Popes and Councils have declared this to be a point of Faith; therefore if he doth not hold it, he muſt be damned. There is no way of anſwering this, but he muſt abate the ſeverity of his Sentence againſt us. For upon the ſame Reaſon he queſtions that, we may queſtion many more. And all his Arguments againſt us, will hold againſt himſelf; *For*, ſaith he, *he that diſbelieves one Article of Catholick Faith, does in a manner diſbelieve all.* Let him therefore look to it, as well as we. But he endeavours to prove *the Roman Catholick Church to be the true Church, by the ordinary Notes and Marks of the Church.* Although he is far enough from doing it; yet this will not do his buſineſs. For he muſt prove, that we are convinced that it is the true Church; and then indeed he may charge us with *Obſtinate Oppoſition*, but not before. And it is a very ſtrange thing to me, that when their Divines ſay, that Infidels ſhall not be damned for their Infidelity, where the Goſpel hath not been ſufficiently propoſed to them; and no Chriſtian for not believing any Article of Faith till it be ſo propoſed; that we muſt be damned for not believing the Articles of the *Roman* Faith, which never have been, and never can be ſufficiently propoſed to us. Methinks ſuch men ſhould Study a little better their own Doctrine, about the ſufficient Propoſal of matters of Faith, before they paſs ſuch uncharitable and unlearned Cenſures. P. 96. P. 97. P. 98.

XXXVI. *Of Ceremonies and Ordinances.*

HIS Diſcourſe on this Head is againſt thoſe who refuſe to obey their Superiours in things not expreſſed in Scripture, which is no part of our Controverſy with them. But yet there are ſeveral things about their Ceremonies we are not ſatisfied in: As 1. The mighty

Num-

Number of them; which have ſo much muffled up the Sacraments, that their true face cannot be diſcerned. 2. The Efficacy attributed to them, without any promiſe from God; whereas we own no more but decency and ſignificancy. 3. The Doctrine that goes along with them, not only of Obedience, but of Merit; and ſome have aſſerted the *Opus Operatum* of Ceremonies as well as Sacraments, when the Power of the Keys goes along with them; *i. e.* when there hath been ſome Act of the Church exerciſed about the Matter of them; as in the Conſecration of Oyl, Salt, Bread, Aſhes, Water, &c.

XXXVII. *Of Innovation in matters of Faith.*

P. 108, 109. THE Subſtance of his Diſcourſe on this Head may be reduced to theſe things. 1. *That the Church in every Age hath Power to declare what is neceſſary to be believed, with Anathema to thoſe who Preach the Contrary; and ſo the Council of* Trent, *in declaring Tranſubſtantiation, Purgatory,* &c. *to be neceſſary Articles, did no more than*

P. 112, &c. *the Church had done before on like Occaſions.* 2. *That if the Doctrines then defined had been Innovations, they muſt have met with great Oppoſition when they were introduced.*

P. 116. 3. *That thoſe who charged thoſe points to be Innovations, might as well have laid the ſcandal on any other Article of Faith which they retained.*

Theſe are things neceſſary to be examined, in order to the making good the charge of Innovation in matters of Faith, which we believe doth ſtand on very good Grounds.

1. We are to conſider, Whether the Council of *Trent* had equal Reaſon to define the neceſſity of theſe Points, as the Council of *Nice* and *Conſtantinople* had to determin

P. 109. the point of the Trinity; or thoſe of *Epheſus* and *Chalcedon*, the Truth of Chriſt's Incarnation. He doth not aſ-

ſert

ſert it to be in the Churches Power to make new Articles of Faith, as they do imply new Doctrines revealed; but he contends earneſtly, That the Church hath a Power to declare the neceſſity of believing ſome points which were not ſo declared before. And if the Neceſſity of believing doth depend upon the Churches Declaration, then he muſt aſſert, that it is in the Churches Power to make points neceſſary to be believed which were not ſo; and conſequently to make common Opinions to become Articles of Faith. But I hope we may have leave to enquire in this Caſe, ſince the Church pretends to no new Revelation of matters of Doctrine, therefore it can declare no more than it receives, and no otherwiſe than it receives. And ſo nothing can be made neceſſary to Salvation but what God himſelf hath made ſo by his Revelation. So that they muſt go in their Declaration either upon Scripture, or Univerſal Tradition; but if they define any Doctrine to be neceſſary without theſe Grounds, they exceed their Commiſſion, and there is no Reaſon to ſubmit to their Decrees, or to believe their Declarations. To make this more plain by a known Inſtance: It is moſt certain that ſeveral Popes and Councils have declared the Depoſing Doctrine, and yet our Author ſaith, *It is no Article of Faith with him.* Why not, ſince the Popes and Councils have as evidently delivered it, as the Council of *Trent* hath done Purgatory, or Tranſubſtantiation? But he may ſay, *There is no Anathema joined to it.* Suppoſe there be not; But why may it not be, as well as in the other Caſes? And if it were, I would know, whether in his Conſcience he would then believe it to be a neceſſary Article of Faith, though he believed that it wanted Scripture and Tradition? If not, then he ſees what this matter is brought to, *viz.* That altho the Council of *Trent* declare theſe new Doctrines to be neceſſary to be believed; yet if their Declaration be not built on Scripture and Univerſal Tradition, we are not bound to receive it.

2. *As*

2. *As to the impossibility of Innovations coming in without notorious opposition*, I see no ground at all for it, where the alteration is not made at once, but proceeds gradually. He may as well prove it impossible for a Man to fall into a *Dropsy* or a *Hectick-Fever*, unless he can tell the punctual time when it began. And he may as well argue thus, Such a Man fell into a Fever upon a great Debauch, and the Physicians were presently sent for to advise about him; therefore the other Man hath no Chronical Distemper, because he had no Physicians when he was first sick; as because Councils were called against some Heresies, and great Opposition made to them, therefore where there is not the like, there can be no *Innovation*. But I see no Reason why we should decline giving an Account, by what Degrees, and Steps, and upon what Occasions, and with what Opposition several of the Doctrines defined at *Trent* were brought in. For the matter is not so obscure as you would make it, as to most of the Points in difference between us. But that is too large a Task to be here undertaken.

3. There is no Colour for calling in Question the Articles of Faith received by us on the same Grounds that we reject those defined by the Council of *Trent*; for we have the Universal Consent of the Christian World for the Apostles Creed; and of the Four General Councils for the Doctrines of the Trinity and Incarnation; who never pretended to determin any Point to be necessary which was not revealed in Scripture; whose sense was delivered down by the Testimony of the Christian Church from the Apostles times. But the Council of *Trent* proceeded by a very different Rule; for it first set up *an Unwritten Word* to be a Rule of Faith, as well as *the Written*; which although it were necessary in order to their Decrees, was one of the greatest Innovations in the World; and the Foundation of all the rest, as they were there established.

Sess. Quartâ.

An

An Answer to the *CONCLUSION.*

HAving thus gone through the several Heads, which our Author complains have been so much *Misrepresented*; it is now fit to consider what he saith in his *Conclusion*, which he makes to answer his *Introduction*, by renewing therein his doleful Complaints of their being *Misrepresented just as Christ and his Apostles, and the Primitive Christians were.* I hope the former Discourse hath shewed their Doctrines and Practices are not so very like those of *Christ and his Apostles, and the Primitive Christians*, that their Cases should be made so parallel; but as in his Conclusion he hath summed up the substance of his *Representations*, so I shall therein follow his Method, only with this difference, that I shall in one Column set down his own *Representations* of Popery, and in the other the Reasons, in short, why we cannot embrace them. P. 119.

Wherein Popery consists as Represented by this Author.

1. IN using all external Acts of Adoration before Images, as *Kneeling, Praying, lifting up the Eyes, burning Candles, Incense*, &c. Not merely to worship the Objects before them, but to worship the Images themselves on the account of the Objects represented by them; or in his own Words, *Because the Honour that is exhibited to them, is referred to the Prototypes which they represent.* P. 3.

Our Reasons against it in the several Particulars.

1. *THou shalt not make to thy self any graven Image, or any likeness of any thing in Heaven, or Earth*, &c. *Thou shalt not bow down to them, nor worship them.* Which being the plain, clear, and express Words of the Divine Law, we dare not worship any Images, or Representations, lest we be found Transgressors of this Law. Especially since God herein hath declared himself a *Jealous God*; and annexed so severe a Sanction

Popery as Represented.

Our Reasons against it.

on to it. And since he that made the Law is only to interpret it, all the Distinctions in the World can never satisfie a Mans Conscience, unless it appear that God himself did either make or approve them. And if God allow the Worship of the thing Represented by the Representation, he would never have forbidden that Worship absolutely, which is unlawful only in a certain respect.

2. *In joining the Saints in Heaven together with Christ in Intercession for us, and making Prayers on Earth to them on that Account.* P. 5.

2. *We have an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous,* 1 John 2. 1. *And but one Mediator between God and Men, the Man Christ Jesus,* 1 Tim. 2. 5. *For Christ is entred into Heaven it self, now to appear in the Presence of God for us,* Heb. 9. 24. And therefore we dare not make other *Intercessors in Heaven* besides him; and the distance between Heaven and us, breaks off all Communication between the Saints there, and us upon Earth; so that all Addresses to them now for their Prayers, are in a way very different from desiring others on earth to pray for us: And if such Addresses are made in the solemn Offices of Divine Worship, they join the Creatures with

3. *In allowing more Supplications to be used to the Blessed Virgin, than to Christ*; For he denies it to be *an idle Superstition*, to repeat *Ten Ave Maria's* for one *Pater Noster*.

4. *In giving Religious Honour and Respect to Relicks.* Such as placing them upon Altars, burn-

with the Creator in the Acts and Signs of Worship, which are due to God alone.

3. *Call upon me in the Day of Trouble, I will deliver thee, and thou shalt glorifie me*, Psal. 50. 15. When we pray to *Our Father in Heaven*, as our Saviour commanded us, we do but what both Natural and Christian Religion require us to do: But when men pray to the Blessed Virgin for *Help and Protection now, and at the Hour of Death*, they attribute that to her, which belongs only to God, who is our *Helper and Defender*: And altho Christ knew *the Dignity of his Mother* above all others, he never gives the least encouragement to make such Addresses to her: And to suppose her to have a share now in the Kingdom of Christ in Heaven, as a Copartner with him, is to advance a Creature to Divine Honour, and to overthrow the true Ground of Christs Exaltation to his Kingdom in Heaven, which was, His suffering on the Cross for us.

4. *And no man knoweth of the Sepulcher of Moses unto this day*, Deut. 34. 6. Why should God

ing Wax-Candles before them, carrying them in Proceſſions, to be ſeen, touched, or humbly kiſſed by the People: Which are the known and allowed Practices in the Church of *Rome.* P. 8.

hide the Body of *Moſes* from the People, if he allowed *giving Religious Honour and Reſpect to Relicks?* Why ſhould *Hezekiah break in Pieces the Brazen Serpent, becauſe the Children of Iſrael did burn Incenſe to it?* 2 Kings 18. 4. Eſpecially when it was a Type or Repreſentation of Chriſt himſelf, and God had wrought many Miracles by it.

5. *In adoring Chriſt as preſent in the Euchariſt on the account of the Subſtance of Bread and Wine being changed into that Body of Chriſt which ſuffered on the Croſs.* P. 10.

5. *Whom the Heaven muſt receive until the times of the Reſtitution of all things,* Acts 3. 21. And therefore in the Euchariſt we adore him, as *ſitting on the Right Hand of God*; but we dare not direct our Adoration to the Conſecrated Hoſt, which we believe to be the Subſtance of Bread and Wine, (tho conſecrated to a Divine Myſtery), and therefore not a fit Object for our Adoration.

6. *In believing the Subſtance of Bread and Wine by the Words of Conſecration, to be changed into his own Body and Blood, the Species only or Accidents of Bread and Wine remaining as before.* P. 10.

6. *The Bread which we break, is it not the Communion of the Body of Chriſt,* 1 Cor. 10. 16. This is ſpoken of the *Bread* after Conſecration, and yet the Apoſtle ſuppoſes it to be Bread ſtill, and the *Communion of his Body* is interpreted by the next Words, *For we being many, are one Bread,*

and

Popery as Repreſented.

Our Reaſons againſt it.

and one Body; for we are all Partakers of that one Bread, v. 17. Which is very different from the Bread being changed into the very Body of Chriſt; which is an Opinion that hath no Foundation in Scripture, and is repugnant to the common Principles of Reaſon, which God hath given us, and expoſes Chriſtian Religion to the Reproach and Contempt of *Jews, Turks, and Infidels.*

7. *In making good Works to be truly meritorious of Eternal Life.* P. 13.

7. *When ye ſhall have done all thoſe things which are commanded you, ſay, We are unprofitable ſervants, we have done that which was our duty to do*, St. Luk. 17.10. And therefore in no ſenſe can our beſt Works be *truly Meritorious of Eternal Life*: Which conſiſting in the enjoyment of God, it is impoſſible there ſhould be any juſt Proportion, or due Commenſuration between our beſt Actions, and ſuch a Reward.

8. *In making Confeſſion of our Sins to a Prieſt in order to Abſolution.* P. 14.

8. *And the Son ſaid unto him, Father I have ſinned againſt Heaven, and in thy ſight*, St. Luke 15.21. Where Confeſſion to God is required becauſe the Offence is againſt him, but it is impoſſible for any Man upon earth to forgive

Popery as Represented.

Our Reasons against it.

9. *In the use of Indulgences for taking away the Temporal Punishments of sin, remaining due after the Guilt is remitted.*

forgive those whom God doth not forgive: And he alone can appoint the necessary Conditions of Pardon, among which true Contrition and Repentance is fully declared; but *Confession to a Priest*, tho it may be useful for the ease of the Penitent, is no where in Scripture made necessary for the Forgiveness of Sin.

9. *I said, I will confess my Transgressions unto the Lord; and thou forgavest the iniquity of my sin*, Psal. 32. 5.

If God doth fully forgive the *Guilt* of sin, there remains no Obligation to punishment; for whereever that is, the *guilt* remains: It is true, God may not sometimes fully pardon; but he may reserve some temporal punishment here for his own Honour, or the Chastisement of a penitent Sinner; But then what have any men to do, to pretend that they can take off what God thinks fit to lay on? Can any *Indulgences* prevent pain or Sickness, or sudden Death? But if *Indulgences* be understood only with respect to *Canonical Penances*, they are a most notorious and inexcusable Corruption of the Discipline of the Ancient Church.

Popery as Represented.

10. *In supposing that Penitent Sinners may in some measure satisfy by Prayer, Fasting, Alms, &c. for the Temporal Pain, which by order of God's Justice sometimes remains due, after the Guilt and the Eternal Pain are remitted.* P. 17.

11. *In thinking the Scripture not fit to be read generally by all, without Licence, or in the Vulgar Tongues.* P. 19.

Our Reasons against it.

10. *For if when we were Enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son; much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by his Life*, Rom. 5. 10. And therefore no Satisfaction to the Justice of God is now required from us, for the Expiation of any remainder of Guilt. For if Christ's Satisfaction were in it self sufficient for a total Remission, and was so accepted by God; what Account then remains for the Sinner to discharge, if he perform the Conditions on his part? But we do not take away hereby the Duties of *Mortification*, *Prayer*, *Fasting*, and *Alms*, &c. but there is a difference to be made between the *Acts* of *Christian Duties*, and *Satisfaction to Divine Justice* for the Guilt of Sin, either in whole or in part. And to think to joyn any Satisfactions of ours, together with Christs, is like joyning our hand with Gods in Creating or Governing the World.

11. *Let the Word of Christ dwell in you richly in all Wisdom; teaching and admonishing one another*, &c. *Coloss.* 3. 16.

How

Popery as Repreſented.

12. *In allowing the Books of* Tobit, Judith, Eccleſiaſticus, Wiſdom, Maccabees, *to be Canonical.* P. 21.

Our Reaſons againſt it.

How could that *dwell richly in them*, which was not to be communicated to them, but with great Caution? How could *they teach and admoniſh one another* in a Language not underſtood by them? The Scriptures of the *New Teſtament* were very early perverted; and if this Reaſon were ſufficient to keep them out of the Hands of the People, certainly they would never have been publiſhed for common uſe, but as prudently diſpenſed then, as ſome think it neceſſary they ſhould be now. But we eſteem it a part of our Duty, not to think our ſelves wiſer than Chriſt or his Apoſtles, nor to deprive them of that unvaluable Treaſure which our Saviour hath left to their uſe.

12. *All Scripture is given by Inſpiration of God*, 2 Tim. 3. 16. *Holy men of God ſpake as they were moved by the Holy-Ghoſt*, 2 Pet. 1. 21.

Therefore, where there is no Evidence of Divine Inſpiration, thoſe Books cannot be made Canonical. But the Jewiſh Church, *To whom the Oracles of God were committed*, never deliver'd theſe Books

Popery as Repreſented.

13. *In preferring the Vulgar Latin Edition of the* Bible *before any other, and not allowing any Tranſlations into a Mother Tongue to be ordinarily read.* P. 24, 26.

Our Reaſons againſt it.

Books as any part of them, being Written when Inſpiration was ceaſed among them. And it is impoſſible for any Church in the World to make that to be divinely inſpired, which was not ſo from the Beginning.

13. *But I ſay, Have they not heard? Yes verily: their ſound went into all the Earth, and their Words unto the ends of the World.* Rom. 10. 18.

Therefore the Intention of God was, that the Goſpel ſhould be underſtood by all Mankind; which it could never be, unleſs it were tranſlated into their ſeveral Languages. But ſtill the difference is to be obſerved, between the Originals and Tranſlations; and no Church can make a *Tranſlation* equal to the *Original*. But among Tranſlations, thoſe deſerve the greateſt eſteem which are done with the greateſt Fidelity and Exactneſs. On which account our laſt Tranſlation deſerves a more particular Regard by us; as being far more uſeful to our People, than the *Vulgar Latin*, or any Tranſlation made only from it.

Popery as Repreſented.

14. *In believing that the Scripture alone can be no Rule of Faith to any Private or Particular Perſon.* P. 28.

15. *In relying upon the Authority of the preſent Church for the Senſe of Scripture.* P. 29.

Our Reaſons againſt it:

14. *Thy Word is a Lamp unto my Feet, and a Light unto my Path,* Pſalm 119. 105.

Which it could never be, unleſs it were ſufficient for neceſſary direction in our way to Heaven. But we ſuppoſe Perſons to make uſe of the beſt means for underſtanding it, and to be duely qualified for following its Directions: without which, the beſt Rule in the World can never attain its End. And if the Scripture hath all the due Properties of a Rule of Faith, it is unconceivable why it ſhould be denied to be ſo; unleſs men find they cannot juſtify their Doctrines and Practiſes by it, and therefore are forced to make Tradition equal in Authority with it.

15. *Wo unto you Lawyers, for ye have taken away the Key of Knowledge; ye entred not in your ſelves, and them that were entering in, ye hindred. S.* Luke 11.52.

From whence it follows, that the preſent Guides of the Church may be ſo far from giving the true Senſe of Scripture, that they may be the chief Means to hinder Men from right underſtanding

16. *In receiving and believing the Churches Traditions as the Doctrine of Christ and his Apostles, and assenting to them with Divine Faith, just as he doth to the* Bible. P. 31, 32.

standing it. Which argument is of greater force, because those who plead for the Infallibility of the Guides of the present Church, do urge the Promises made to the Jewish Church at that time; as our Author doth from those *who sat in the Chair of* Moses, *and from* Caiaphas *his Prophesying.*

16. *We have also a more sure Word of Prophesie; whereunto ye do well that ye take heed,* 2 Pet. 1. 19.

And yet here the Apostle speaks of something delivered by the Testimony of those who were with Christ in the holy Mount. From whence we infer, that it was not the Design of Christ to leave us to any *Vocal Testimony*, but to refer us to the *Written Word*, as the most certain Foundation of Faith. And it is not any persons assuming the Title of the Catholick Church to themselves, can give them Authority to impose any Traditions on the Faith of Christians; or require them to be believed equally with the Written Word. For before any Traditions can be assented to with Divine Faith, the Churches Autho-

rity muſt be proved to be Divine and Infallible, either by a written or unwritten Word; but it can be done by neither, without overthrowing the Neceſſity of ſuch an Infallibility in order to Divine Faith; becauſe the Teſtimony on which the Churches Infallibility is proved, muſt be received only in a way of Credibility.

17. *In believing that the Preſent Guides of the Church being aſſembled in Councils for preſerving the Unity of the Church, have an Infallible Aſſiſtance in their Decrees.* P. 38.

17. *Alſo of your own ſelves ſhall Men ariſe, ſpeaking perverſe things to draw away Diſciples after them,* Act. 20. 30.

Which being ſpoken of the *Guides* of the *Chriſtian Church*, without limitation of Number, a poſſibility of Error is implied in any Aſſembly of them; unleſs there were ſome other Promiſes which did aſſure us, That in all great Aſſemblies the Spirit of God ſhall always go with the Caſting Voice, or the greater Number.

18. *In believing the Pope to be the Supreme Head of the Church under Chriſt, being Succeſſour to S.* Peter *to whom he committed the care of his Flock.* P. 40. 41.

18. *And he gave ſome Apoſtles, and ſome Prophets, and ſome Evangeliſts, and ſome Paſtors and Teachers — for the edifying of the Body of Chriſt — till we all come in the Unity of the Faith,* &c. Epheſ. 4. 13, 14, 15.

Now

Popery as Represented.

19. *In believing that Communion in both Kinds is an indifferent thing; and was so held for the first Four hundred years after Christ; and that the first Precept for Receiving under both Kinds, was given to the Faithful by Pope* Leo I. *and confirmed by Pope* Gelasius. P. 51.

Our Reasons against it.

Now here being an account given of the Officers Christ appointed in his Church, in order to the *Unity* and *Edification* of it, it had been unfaithfulness in the Apostle to have left out the Head of it, in Case Christ had appointed any. Because this were of more consequence than all the rest; being declared necessary to Salvation to be in subjection to him. But neither this Apostle, nor S. *Peter* himself, give the least intimation of it. Which it is impossible to conceive should have been left out in the Apostolical Writings upon so many Occasions of mentioning it, if ever Christ had instituted a Headship in the Church, and given it to S. *Peter* and his Successors in the See of *Rome*.

19. *For as often as ye eat this Bread, and drink this Cup, ye do shew the Lord's death till he come,* 1 Cor. 15. 26.

The Apostle speaking to all Communicants, plainly shews, that the Institution of Christ was, That all should partake of both Kinds, and so to continue to do as long as this Sacrament was to shew forth the Death of Christ,

Popery as Repreſented.

Our Reaſons againſt it.

Chriſt, *viz.* till his Second coming. And there is no colour for aſſerting the Chriſtian Church ever looked on obſerving Chriſts Inſtitution in this matter as an indifferent thing; no not for a thouſand years after Chriſt. Altho the Practiſe and the Obligation are two things, yet when the Practiſe was ſo agreeable to the Inſtitution, and continued ſo long in the Church; it is hardly poſſible for us to prove the ſenſe of the Obligation, by a better way, than by the continuance of the Practiſe. And if ſome Traditions muſt be thought binding, and far from being indifferent, which want all that Evidence which this Practiſe carries along with it, How unreaſonable is it in this Caſe to allow the Practiſe, and to deny the Obligation?

20. *In believing that the Doctrine of Purgatory is founded on Scripture, Authority, and Reaſon.* P. 54, &c.

20. *And whom he juſtified, them he alſo glorified,* Rom. 8. 30.

But whom God juſtifies, they have the Remiſſion of their Sins as to Eternal Puniſhment. And if thoſe who are thus juſtified, muſt be glorified, what place is there for Purgatory? For there is not the leaſt intimation of any other

Popery as Represented.

Our Reasons against it.

other state of Punishment that any who are justified must pass through before they are admitted to Glory. We grant they may, notwithstanding, pass through many intermediate trials in this World; but we say, where there is Justification, there is *no Condemnation*; but where any part of Guilt remains unremitted, there is a condemnation remaining so far as the punishment extends. And so this distinction as to Eternal and Temporal Pains, as it is made the Foundation of Purgatory, is wholly groundless; and therefore the Doctrine built upon it can have no Foundation in Scripture or Reason.

21. *In believing that to the saying of Prayers well and devoutly, it is not necessary to have attention on the Words, or on the Sense of Prayers.* P. 62.

21. *I will pray with the Spirit, and I will pray with the understanding also,* 1 Cor. 14. 15.

What need *this Praying with the Understanding*, if there were no necessity of attending to the Sense of Prayers? For then *praying with the Spirit* were all that was required: For that supposes *an attention of the Mind upon God.* And I can hardly believe any Man that thinks with understanding, can justify praying with-

Popery as Represented.

22. *In believing that none out of the Communion of the Church of* Rome *can be saved; and that it is no uncharitableness to think so.* P. 92.

23. *In believing that the Church of* Rome, *in all the New Articles defined at* Trent, *hath made no Innovation in matters of Faith.* P. 107.

Our Reasons against it.

without it: Especially when there are Exhortations and Invitations to the People to joyn in those Prayers, as it is plain there are in the *Roman* Offices.

22. *Then Peter opened his mouth, and said, Of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of Persons; but in every Nation, he that feareth God, and worketh Righteousness, is accepted with him,* Acts 10. 34, 35.

Whereby we perceive, that God doth not limit the possibility of Salvation under the Gospel to Communion with the See of *Rome*; for if S. *Peter* may be believed, the capacity of Salvation depends upon Mens *fearing God and working Righteousness*; and it is horrible uncharritablebleness to exclude those from a possibility of Salvation, whom God doth not exclude from it.

23. *That ye should earnestly contend for the Faith which was once delivered to the Saints,* Jude *v.* 3.

Therefore all necessary Doctrines of Faith were at first delivered; and whatever Articles cannot be proved to have been delivered by the Apostles, can never be made necessary to be be-

believed in order to Salvation. VVhich overthrows the additional Creed of *Pius* IV. after the Council of *Trent*; and puts them upon the necessity of proving the Universal Tradition of those Doctrines from the Apostolical Times: And when they do that, we may think better of them than at present we do; for as yet we can see neither *Scripture*, nor *Reason*, nor *Antiquity* for them.

THUS I have *Represented* that kind of *Popery* which our Author, (who complains so much of *Misrepresenting*) allows; and I have in short, set down how little ground we have to be fond of it; nay, to speak more plainly, it is that we can never yield to, without betraying the Truth, renouncing our Senses and Reason, wounding our Consciences, dishonouring God and his Holy Word and Sacraments, perverting the Doctrine of the Gospel as to Christs Satisfaction, Intercession and Remission of Sins; depriving the People of the Means of Salvation which God himself hath appointed, and the Primitive Church observed, and damning those for whom Christ died.

We do now in the sincerity of our Hearts, appeal to God and the World, That we have no design to *Misrepresent* them, or to make their Doctrines and Practises appear worse than they are: But take them with all the Advantages even this Author hath set them out with, we dare appeal to the Judgments and Consciences of any impartial men, whether (the Scripture being allowed on both sides) our Doctrines be not far more agreeable thereto than the *new Articles* of *Trent*, which are the very Life and Soul of Popery? Whether our Worship of God be not more suitable to the Divine

Nature and Perfections, and the Manifeſtations of his Will, than the *Worſhip of Images*, and *Invocation of Fellow-Creatures*? Whether the plain Doctrine of the neceſſity of Repentance and ſincere Obedience to the Commands of Chriſt, do not tend more to promote Holineſs in the World, than *the Sacrament of Penance*, as it is delivered and allowed to be practiſed in the Church of *Rome*, i. e. with the *eaſineſs* and *efficacy* of *Abſolution*, and getting off the remainders by *Indulgences*, *Satisfactions* of others, and *Prayers for the dead*? Whether it be not more according to the Inſtitution of Chriſt to have *the Communion in both Kinds*, and to have *Prayers and the Scriptures in a Language which the People underſtand*? And laſtly, whether there be not more of *Chriſtian charity* in believing and hoping the beſt of thoſe vaſt bodies of Chriſtians, who live out of the Communion of the Church of *Rome*, in the *Eaſtern*, *Southern*, *Weſtern*, and *Northern* Parts, than to pronounce them all uncapable of Salvation on that Account? And therefore out of regard to God and the Holy Religion of our Bleſſed Saviour; out of regard to the Salvation of our own and others Souls, we cannot but very much prefer the Communion of our own Church, before that of the *Church* of *Rome*.

But before I conclude all, I muſt take ſome notice of his *Anathema's*: And here I am as much unſatisfied, as in any other part of his Book, and that for theſe Reaſons,

1. Becauſe he hath no manner of Authority to make them, ſuppoſe they were meant never ſo ſincerely: And if we ſhould ever object them to any others of that Church, they would preſently ſay, *What had he to do to make Anathema's? It belongs only to the Church and the General Councils to pronounce Anethema's, and not to any private Perſon whatſoever.* So that if he would have publiſhed *Anathema's* with Authority, he ought to have printed thoſe of the Council of *Trent*; *viz.* ſuch as theſe,

Curſed is he that doth not allow the Worſhip of Images.
Curſed is he that ſaith Saints are not to be invocated.
Curſed is he that doth not believe Tranſubſtantiation, Purgatory, &c.

2. Becauſe he leaves out an *Anathema* in a very material point, *viz.*

viz. As to the Depoſing Doctrine. We do freely, and from our Hearts *Anathematize* all ſuch Doctrines as tend to diſſolve the Bonds of Allegiance to our Soveraign, on any pretence whatſoever. Why was this paſt over by him, without any kind of *Anathema*? Since he ſeems to approve the *Oxford Cenſures*, p. 48. Why did he not here ſhow his zeal againſt all ſuch dangerous Doctrines? *If the Depoſing Doctrine* be falſly charged upon their Church, let us but once ſee it *Anathematized* by publick Authority of their Church, and we have done: But in ſtead thereof, we find in a Book very lately publiſhed with great approbations, by a preſent *Profeſſor* at *Lovain Fr. D'Enghien*, all the Cenſures on the other ſide cenſured and deſpiſed, and the holding the Negative as to *the Depoſing Doctrine*, is declared by him to be *Hereſie, or next to Hereſie*: The Cenſure of the *Sorbon* againſt *Sanctarellus*, he ſaith, *was only done by a Faction; and that of Sixty Eight Doctors there were but Eighteen Preſent; and the late Cenſure of the* Sorbon, he ſaith, *was condemned by the Inquiſition at Toledo*, Jan. 10. 1683. *as erroneous and Schiſmatical*; and ſo by the *Clergy* of *Hungary*, Oct. 24. 1682.

Auctoritas Sedis Apoſtolicæ in Reges. p. 374, 408. ad 430.

P. 549.

We do not queſtion but there are Divines that oppoſe it; but we fear there are too many who do not; and we find they boaſt of their own numbers, and deſpiſe the reſt as an inconſiderable Party: This we do not *Miſrepreſent* them in, for their moſt approved Books do ſhew it.

However, we do not queſtion, but there are ſeveral Worthy and Loyal Gentlemen of that Religion, of *different Principles and Practiſes:* And it is pity ſuch be not diſtinguiſhed from thoſe who will not renounce a Doctrine ſo dangerous in the Conſequences of it.

3. Becauſe the *Anathema's* he hath ſet down, are not Penned ſo plainly and clearly, as to give any real Satisfaction; but with ſo much Art and Sophiſtry, as if they were intended to beguile weak and unwary Readers, who ſee not into the depth of theſe things, and therefore may think he hath done great matters in his *Anathema's*, when if they be ſtrictly examined, they come to little or nothing; as

1. *Curſed is he that commits Idolatry.* An unwary Reader would think herein he diſowned all that he accuſes of *Idolatry*; but he

doth not curſe any thing as *Idolatry*, but what *himſelf* thinks to be ſo. So again, *Curſed is he* (not that gives Divine Worſhip to Images, but) *that prays to Images, or Relicks as Gods, or Worſhips them for Gods.* So that if he doth not take the Images themſelves for Gods, he is ſafe enough from his own *Anathema.*

2. *Curſed is every goddeſs worſhipper, i.e.* That believes the Bleſſed Virgin not to be a Creature. And ſo they eſcape all the force of this *Anathema. Curſed is he that Honours her, or puts his truſt in her more than in God.* So that if they Honour her and truſt in her but juſt as much as in God, they are ſafe enough; *Or that believes her to be above her Son*: But no *Anathema* to ſuch as ſuppoſe her to be equal to him.

3. *Curſed is he that believes the Saints in Heaven to be his Redeemer, that prays to them as ſuch.* VVhat if men pray to them as their *Spiritual Guardians and Protectors*? Is not this giving Gods Honour to them? Doth this deſerve no *Anathema*?

4. *Curſed is he that worſhips any breaden God, or makes God of the empty Elements of Bread and Wine*: *viz.* That ſuppoſes them to be *nothing but Bread and Wine*, and yet ſuppoſes them to be *Gods* too. Doth not this look like nonſenſe: And yet I am afraid our Author would think it a ſevere *Anathema* in this matter, to ſay, *Curſed is he who believes Nonſenſe and Contradictions.*

It will be needleſs to ſet down more, ſince I have endeavoured by clear ſtating the ſeveral Controverſies to prevent the Readers being impoſed upon by deceitful *Anathema's.* And yet after all he ſaith, *Curſed are we, if in anſwering and ſaying* Amen *to any of theſe Curſes, we uſe any Equivocations or Mental Reſervation, or do not aſſent to them in the common and obvious uſe of the Words.*

But there may be no Equivocation in the very VVords, and yet there may be a great one in the intention and deſign of them: There may be none in ſaying *Amen* to the Curſes ſo worded; but if he would have prevented all ſuſpicion of Equivocation, he ought to have put it thus,

Curſed are we if we have not fairly and ingenuouſly expreſſed the whole Meaning of our Church as to the Points condemned in theſe Anathema's; or if we have by them deſigned to deceive the People: And then I doubt he would not ſo readily have ſaid *Amen.* THE

THE CONTENTS.

An Answer to his Introduction.	Page 1.
1. *Of Praying to Images.*	p. 16.
2. *Of Worshiping Saints.*	p. 25.
3. *Of Addressing more Supplications to the Virgin* Mary *than to Christ.*	p. 34.
4. *Of Paying Divine Worship to Relicks.*	p. 40.
5. *Of Adoration of the Host.*	p. 43.
6. *Of Transubstantiation.*	p. 46.
7. *Of Merits and good Works.*	p. 55.
8. *Of Confession.*	p. 60.
9. *Of Indulgencies.*	p. 63.
10. *Of Satisfaction.*	p. 66.
11. *Of Reading the Holy Scriptures.*	p. 68.
12. *Of Apocryphal Books*	p. 82.
13. *Of the Vulgar Edition of the Bible.*	p. 84.
14. *Of the Scripture as a Rule of Faith.*	p. 86.
15. *Of the Interpretation of Scripture.*	p. 87.
16. *Of Tradition.*	p. 89.
17. *Of Councils.*	p. 90.
18. *Of Infallibility in the Church.*	p. 91.
19. *Of the Pope.*	p. 94.
20. *Of Dispensations.*	p. 97.
21. *Of the Deposing Power.*	p. 101.
22. *Of Communion in one Kind.*	p. 107.
23. *Of the Mass.*	p. 108.
24. *Of Purgatory.*	p. 113.
25. *Of Praying in an Unknown Tongue.*	p. 119.
26. *Of the Second Commandment.*	p. 123.

27. *Of Mental Reservations.* p. 124.
28. *Of a Deathbed Repentance.* p. 126.
29. *Of Fasting.* p. 127.
30. *Of Schisms and Divisions in the Church.* p. 129.
31. *Of Friers and Nuns.* p. 131.
32. *Of Wicked Principles and Practises.* p. 132.
33. *Of Miracles.* p. 134.
34. *Of Holy Water.* p. 136.
35. *Of Breeding up People in Ignorance.* p. 138.
36. *Of the Uncharitableness of the Papists.* p. 139.
37. *Of Ceremonies and Ordinances.* p. 141.
38. *Of Innovations in matters of Faith.* p. 142.
An Answer to his Conclusion. p. 145.

FINIS.

The *ERRATA.*

PAge 18. Margin, for *Conformat*, read *Confirm.* p. 14. l. 19. for *DoDrine*, r. *Doctrine.* p. 35. Margin, for *Lapidiana*, r. *Lapidicina.* p. 39. l. 13. after *publisher* insert *in.* l. 26. after *piece* insert *of.* p. 40. l. 4. blot out ? *Or.* p. 41. l. 4. for *vigdantius*, r. *vigilantius.* p. 82. l. 18. after *cannot*, blot out *say.* p. 88. l. 12. for *Solemn*, r. *Solitary.* p. 96. Margin, for *Sues*, r. *Suris.* ib. for *Philean*, r. *Philerene.* p. 98. l. 26. for *Clavasus*, r. *Clavasius.* p. 101. l. 12. for *Doctrine*, r. *Doctors.* p. 106. Margin, for *D'Erast*, r. *D'Englisen.* p. 112. l. 28. for *Ecclesiastical*, r. *Encharistical.* p. 132. l. 11. before *whether*, insert (3.) p. 134. l. 8. for *st*, r. *are.* l. 20. blot out *as well.* p. 141. l. 4. and l. 19. for *de* r. *be.*

ADVERTISEMENT.

A Discourse against Translation, Printed for W. Rogers.

AU37
19

ADVERTISEMENT.

A Discourse against Transubstantiation, Printed for *W. Rogers*.

63361